

MANNING

Acc. No.	15678
Specimen No.	G. 10.
Spec. No.	442
MANNING	

GREAT LIVES

1. SHAKESPEARE	37. DUMAS PÈRE
2. QUEEN VICTORIA	38. CARLYLE
3. WAGNER	39. SHELLEY
4. JOHN WESLEY	40. FARADAY
5. JOSHUA REYNOLDS	41. MOZART
6. CECIL RHODES	42. HANDEL
7. GLADSTONE	43. GARIBALDI
8. GEORGE ELIOT	44. COBDEN
9. THE BRONTËS	45. GORDON
10. CHARLES II	46. DRAKE
11. DICKENS	47. TOLSTOY
12. BEETHOVEN	48. ABRAHAM LINCOLN
13. H. M. STANLEY	49. CAPTAIN COOK
14. WILLIAM BLAKE	50. DOCTOR JOHNSON
15. SHERIDAN	51. WOLSEY
16. ROBERT BURNS	52. PRINCE CHARLES EDWARD
17. EDWARD VII	53. PALMERSTON
18. THACKERAY	54. THOMAS GRAY
19. NAPOLEON III	55. WILLIAM Pitt
20. STRINDBERG	56. DE QUINCEY
21. NELSON	57. KEIR HARDIE
22. CHOPIN	58. FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE
23. NIETZSCHE	59. KING JAMES I
24. HAIG	60. SPINOZA
25. BACH	61. LIVINGSTONE
26. MILTON	62. WORDSWORTH
27. DARWIN	63. ALFRED THE GREAT
28. BYRON	64. RUSKIN
29. VAN GOGH	65. DISRAELI
30. JANE AUSTEN	66. JOHN KNOX
31. CHARLES LAMB	67. WELLINGTON
32. KEATS	68. CARDINAL MANNING
33. WILLIAM MORRIS	69. DOSTOEVSKY
34. HUXLEY	70. ASQUITH
35. W. G. GRACE	—. QUEEN ELIZABETH
36. NEWMAN	—. CLIVE

A complete list of the GREAT LIVES with the authors' names
can be had on application.

DUCKWORTH, 3 Henrietta Street, London, W.C.2.

MANNING

by SIDNEY DARK

Great Lives

DUCKWORTH
3 HENRIETTA STREET
LONDON W.C.2

First published . . . 1936
All rights reserved

Acc. No.	15678
Class No.	G. 10.
Book No.	440

Made and printed in Great Britain
By The Camelot Press Ltd
London and Southampton

CONTENTS

Chapter I. From Evangelicalism to Rome *page* 9

Birth and Parentage - Harrow - Balliol - the Colonial Office - returns to Oxford - ordained - Lavington - marriage - death of wife - Archdeacon of Chichester - the Gorham Judgment - received into the Roman Catholic Church - ordained priest - goes to Rome - the Papal Aggression scare.

Chapter II. The Ultramontane 32

Wiseman - his opinion of Manning - "Widowers' House" - appointed Provost of the Westminster Chapter - opposition - succeeds Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster - views on Ireland - the Vatican Council of 1869 - made a Cardinal - refuses the Papal crown.

Chapter III. The People's Cardinal 65

Interest in social problems - relations with contemporaries - puritanical ideas - sympathy with Labour - formulates a Christian sociology - settles dock strike of 1889 - views on Home Rule - member of Royal Commissions on Housing and Education.

Chapter IV. The Jesuits and Newman 103

Hostility to Jesuits - *The Episcopal Office* - misunderstandings with Newman - Newman made a Cardinal.

Chapter V. The Closing Years 121

Failing grip - sympathy with Salvation Army - illness and death - diary of his retreat at Highgate in 1865.

Chapter VI. The Two Achievements 130

The Cardinal and the General - Manning's social enthusiasm - its influence on Christendom - a great national figure - conclusion.

CHRONOLOGY

1808....Manning born at Totteridge in Hertfordshire.

1818....Manning went to Harrow.

1827....Matriculated at Balliol College, Oxford.

1829....President of the Union.

1831....Clerk in the Colonial Office.

1832....Fellow of Merton College, Oxford.

1833....Ordained priest in the Church of England.

1833....Married Caroline Sargent.

1837....His wife died.

1841....Archdeacon of Chichester.

1851....Received into the Roman Catholic Church.

1857....Provost of the Westminster Chapter.

1865....Archbishop of Westminster.

1870....Present at the Vatican Council.

1875....Received the Cardinal's hat.

1889....Settled the London dock strike.

1892....Died.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I HAVE pleasure in acknowledging my indebtedness to Mr. Shane Leslie for his gracious help and suggestions to me while writing this little book. His will always be the standard biography of the great Cardinal. Mine claims to be no more than a sketch, written from another point of view.

S. D.

CHAPTER I

FROM EVANGELICALISM TO ROME

Birth and Parentage – Harrow – Balliol – the Colonial Office – returns to Oxford – ordained – Lavington – marriage – death of wife – Archdeacon of Chichester – the Gorham Judgment – received into the Roman Catholic Church – ordained priest – goes to Rome – the Papal Aggression scare.

HENRY EDWARD MANNING was born on July 15th, 1808, seven and a half years after the birth of John Henry Newman. He was born on St. Swithun's Day “in a tremendous storm of thunder, lightning, hail and rain.” Newman belonged to a well-to-do evangelical city family. Manning was partly city and partly county. His father was a member of Parliament and Governor of the Bank of England, and his godparents were Lord Sidmouth and Lady Lavington. The lady was by birth an Austrian, and, of course, a Roman Catholic, who had changed her religion when she married an Englishman. According to the traditions of his family, the future teetotal Cardinal was baptised in an old punch-bowl with the family arms on it !

Manning, like Newman, was brought up in the Evangelical Movement of the early years of the nineteenth century. His early childhood was

spent at Totteridge. He was prepared for confirmation with Brand, who was afterwards Speaker of the House of Commons, and Sidney Herbert, whose name, as Minister of War during the Crimean war, will always be associated with that of Florence Nightingale. When he was ten, Manning went to Harrow, where he stayed till he was eighteen. Mr. Shane Leslie says :

“ Manning and Byron, on the whole, were the two most famed and exceptional of Harrow boys. Both broke the bonds of English insularity in different ways, and incurred the angry pity of their fellow-islanders. Byron could have become King of Greece and Manning might have been Pope of Rome. They were the ripe fruit of the Romantic and Tractarian Movements respectively, though in the eyes of Englishmen their ripeness resembled the workings of decay.”

Among Manning’s contemporaries at Harrow were Anthony Trollope, who hated the school, and Faber, one of the few boys who ever received Communion there. In 1825, Manning was captain of the Eleven and played against Eton and Winchester. In the latter match he was bowled by Christopher Wordsworth for nought. He was described by a contemporary as “ a handsome, well-mannered, but mightily affected boy.” In the autumn of 1827 Manning went to

Balliol. A year before, Hurrell Froude had been elected a Fellow of Oriel, and had begun the friendship with Newman which so largely prepared the way for the launching of the Tractarian Movement in 1833, and, two years before, Newman had been appointed Vicar of St. Mary's and Pusey had become Regius Professor of Divinity.

At Balliol, Manning worked hard and played hard, and it was while he was an undergraduate that he first met Gladstone in Charles Wordsworth's rooms. He was President of the Union, preceding Gladstone in that honourable position. As an undergraduate he was, as he always remained, a definite Liberal in politics, but he had no patience with religious unbelief, and in a Union debate he defended the expulsion of Shelley from the University.

In the General Election of 1829, Robert Peel lost his seat as a member for the University on the question of Catholic Emancipation, which was opposed by Newman, Keble, and Froude, but was supported by Manning in a speech in the Union. In 1830 he won a first in Greats.

At the University, Manning was apparently uninterested in religion. He may on occasion have heard Newman preach. There is no evidence that the two men met. Politics were

Manning's chief interest, and he had planned for himself a political career. But this was made impossible by his father's loss of his fortune. The Mannings had considerable property in the West Indies. Black servants waited on the family when Manning was a child, and there was a black footman on the box of the coach and four which carried his father to the Bank of England. But in 1831, the year after Manning graduated, negro emancipation wrecked the family fortune and his father was bankrupt. This was the more ironic since William Manning was a close friend of Wilberforce. Manning always remembered the tragic day when his father had to give up at the Guildhall his seals as Governor of the Bank of England, saying sadly to his son, "I have belonged to men to whom bankruptcy is death."

For want of anything better, Manning obtained a clerkship in the Colonial Office with a salary of £80 a year, and was miserably unhappy. "I am splenetic, sick, savage, rabid, indolent, useless and ill at ease." But in the Colonial Office he made friends with Robert Bevan, and this friendship was the prelude to one of the turning-points in Manning's life. Bevan introduced him to his aunt, a pious Evangelical lady, who set herself to angle for his soul. His poverty was doubtless partially responsible for his growing conviction

of "the vanity of the world." He was not well. He was unhappy. For a time he remained "at the gate knocking." But in January 1832, largely as the result of reading one of Wesley's sermons, he determined to leave the Colonial Office, with the idea of taking Holy Orders. He went back to Oxford for a while, and was elected a Fellow of Merton, where he read theology, and in December he was ordained deacon by Bishop Bagot, preaching his first sermon at Cuddesdon Church at Christmas. He was ordained priest in Lincoln's Inn chapel in June 1833.

Even then, young man as he was, "his face was thin and sallow," and it was said of him, by one who knew him well, that pride was his ruling passion.

In January 1833 he went as curate to Lavington in Sussex, becoming rector in June, and marrying the former rector's daughter in November; and for seventeen years he remained, in this out-of-the-way village, entirely outside the revolution that was taking place within the Church of England.

There is no record that the preaching of Keble's Assize sermon, which was to have such profound consequences within and without the Church, was even read in the quiet rectory in Lavington. Manning's wife was a devout Evangelical, and he himself always declared that he was never a Tractarian. The odd truth is that the Catholic

revival, which has revolutionised the Church of England, and, incidentally, took Newman to Rome, apparently affected Manning not at all. He found his own road to Rome. Forty-five years afterwards he wrote :

“ The state of my religious belief in 1833 was profound faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, in the Redemption by the Passion of our Lord, and in the work of the Holy Spirit, and the conversion of the soul. I believed in baptismal regeneration, and in a spiritual, but real receiving of our Lord in Holy Communion. As to the Church, I had no definite conception. I had rejected the whole idea of the Established Church. Erastianism was hateful to me. The royal supremacy was, in my mind, an invasion of the Headship of our Lord. In truth, I had thought and read myself out of contact with every system known to me. Anglicanism was formal and dry, Evangelicalism illogical, and at variance with the New Testament, Nonconformity was to me mere disorder. Of the Catholic Church I knew nothing. I was completely isolated. But I held intensely to the ‘ Word of God,’ and the work of souls. In this state I began preaching to the poor in church, and in their homes.”

At Lavington, Manning was a model country-parish priest. He was concerned with every

aspect of the life of his people. He was approachable, kind-hearted, and sympathetic. He obeyed to the letter the Prayer Book injunction that the Divine Offices shall be said in church every day. A friend said of him : “ It was a picturesque sight to watch the zealous and stately rector, vested in surplice, himself tolling the bell, whilst in the grey of a winter’s morning the straggling villagers hurried to Morning Prayer before going out to their toil in the fields.” Gladstone, who was for years Manning’s most intimate friend, said : “ Manning’s devotion to his pastoral work had the most successful results. The population of the parish was small, but Manning on one occasion told me that almost every parishioner was a communicant.”

He was tireless in visiting his people, and was intelligently interested in the details of their daily lives. He was something of a martinet, and he did not lack the courage to denounce sin in high places, pillorying the Duke of Richmond for “ the sin of exacting the largest rent and doing the least repairs.” And the people loved him. “ He were a wonderful Churchman,” said one of his Lavington parishioners, “ he looked like an archangel when he prayed.” Like St. Thomas of Canterbury and Laud, Manning always attracted the affection of the simple.

In 1835 Manning preached a sermon in Chichester Cathedral, on the English Church, in which he said :

“ Our commission to witness Christ hangs on the question, are the Bishops of our Church the successors in lineal descent of the Lord’s Apostles ? ”

Here, I admit, is the suggestion of Tractarian influence, for the whole Anglo-Catholic case has been based on the belief that the bishops and priests of the Church of England are in the Apostolic Succession. Referring to this sermon years afterwards, and of his own opinions at the time, Manning wrote : “ The Oxford tracts had been coming out for some years. I agreed with them in outline and in the main, but remotely and so as to make me unable to identify myself with them.”

But for all his sympathy with the Tractarian position, so late as 1837 Manning, at the urging of his Evangelical wife, supported the Low Church party in their attempt to obtain control of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, which was founded during the High Church Movement at the beginning of the eighteenth century and is to-day a definitely High Church society.

He never, however, admitted that his Church

was Protestant. In 1836 he published an article in the *British Magazine* criticising a series of lectures delivered by Dr. Wiseman, afterwards Cardinal Wiseman, on the differences between the Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism, asserting that Dr. Wiseman "with his high pretensions to learning was ignorant of the essential difference between the Church of England and other Protestant or dissenting bodies."

Manning's wife died in 1837, after they had been married four years. Lytton Strachey has suggested that in his later life the memory of his wife was blotted from his mind, but because he never spoke of her it is cruelly unfair to suppose that he never thought of her. Seven years after his wife's death he wrote to a friend who was about to be married : "May you be blest as I have been. May you be blest much longer, and yet if sorrow be as good for you as for me, may your lot be as mine." Even after he went to Rome, his wife remained in his mind. He entered the Academia as a priest on her birthday, and he headed the page in his diary : "The Nativity of Caroline most lamented."

In 1838 Manning preached another sermon in Chichester Cathedral, on the rule of faith, and this sermon marked his definite break with the Evangelicals, who had hitherto regarded him as

one of their champions. But he was still careful not to associate himself with Newman and the Tractarians.

In this year the trouble aroused by the publication of the *Tracts of the Times* came to a head. The appointment by the Government of the Ecclesiastical Commission stimulated the hatred of Erastianism which had inspired Keble's Assize Sermon at Oxford five years before. Purcell has said of Manning that "to free the Church of England from the bondage of the State was the desire of his heart, the end and aim of his public labours," and he published a pamphlet denouncing the appointment of the Commission, which was warmly approved by Newman and Pusey. This was almost his first association with the Oxford leaders.

At this time, too, in collaboration with Gladstone, Manning was busy opposing the institution of a national system of secular education.

In the closing weeks of 1838 his health broke down and he was compelled to go for a long holiday on the Continent, reaching Rome twenty-five days after leaving England. He met Wiseman in Rome, but the visit certainly did not affect his loyalty to the Anglican obedience, and his letters are critical of the character and the policy of the Roman Church.

During the years that followed, while he was still at Lavington, he carried on a continual and most interesting correspondence with Gladstone in which they discussed the shortcomings of bishops and the progress of the Roman Church in England. I have always believed that Gladstone was a little fearful of Newman and Pusey. Manning hardly knew them and was temperamentally disinclined to be any man's disciple. He ploughed a lonely furrow. Incidentally he had a great deal to do with the restoration of the Sacrament of Penance in the English Church, and he was concerned with the foundation of more than one Sisterhood.

In 1843 Newman resigned from St. Mary's, Oxford, and all his friends knew that his change of allegiance was inevitable. Gladstone was appalled, and when the news came to Manning he wrote : " God be thanked it does not shake me, but it is like a chill on a wound under which one suffers to the very quick." He invited Newman to come to Lavington, but the invitation was not accepted, and, when Newman was received into the Roman Catholic Church in October 1845, Manning prayed : " May we be guided and kept from and against ourselves." Manning was still a sincere Anglican.

Newman's secession increased Manning's

prestige, and, indeed, gave him for the first time a position of real distinction and influence in the Church of England. He was regarded as a safe man. Though his sympathies might be Catholic, he was no extremist. He seemed to be just such a man as the Bishops of the Church of England have always loved. He stood, so he professed, for "old Church of Englandism." Ritualism had no attraction for him, as indeed it never had for Newman. And so, in due course, two years after Newman's secession, Manning became Archdeacon of Chichester.

He was appointed to the Archdeaconry by Bishop Shuttleworth, an extreme Low Churchman. But Manning was certainly not quite so safe as the Bishop had supposed, for, as Archdeacon, he declared that his desire was "to win the souls of men to Catholicism," by which, of course, he meant to the Church of England as he understood it. He gave himself with characteristic thoroughness to the many duties of his new office. Education occupied much of his thought and his time. He was keen on foreign missions, and encouraged the famous George Selwyn to go to New Zealand.

In his early days as Archdeacon, Manning engaged in a long correspondence with Pusey in which the Tractarian sharply criticised the

Reformation, expressed an increasing admiration for Rome, and discussed the possibility of reunion. Manning was unsympathetic. He was always incapable of half measures. While he was an Anglican, he strove with mind and soul to be a loyal Anglican, and, with Gladstone, he was highly suspicious of what seemed to him Pusey's untenable position.

But in the summer of 1846, Manning began to have his doubts. "I feel," he wrote, "less able to say that Rome is wrong." A bad illness in 1847 intensified his own personal religion. He adopted an ascetic rule of life, which he continued to the end of his days.

At this time Manning spent several months on the Continent, going to Rome with Florence Nightingale and her friend and most loyal supporter, Sidney Herbert, and there, for the first time, he met Pope Pius IX, who was to play so large a part in his life. "His is the most truly English countenance I have seen in Italy," he wrote to Gladstone. It was a highly characteristic comment.

While he was abroad, orthodox opinion in the Church of England had been shocked by the appointment of Dr. Hampden as Bishop of Hereford. Hampden has been described by Canon Ollard as "a very dry and dull divine."

In his Bampton Lectures, delivered in the 'thirties, he threw doubts on the Creeds, and his heresy had been denounced by the Evangelicals as well as by the Tractarians. In Dr. Hampden's teaching, it was said, "Protestantism was stabbed to its very vitals." But Hampden was consecrated, and Manning returned to England unsettled and troubled. One of his first tasks was to issue an Archidiaconal Charge in which, as he confessed, he was really defending his own position against the Church of England.

So the years passed in perplexity and study of the Fathers until the famous Gorham Judgment in 1850. The Bishop of Exeter, an old-fashioned High Churchman, refused to institute Gorham to the benefice of Bramford Speke because he rejected the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Gorham appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, a court the jurisdiction of which in spiritual affairs Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics have always repudiated, which found that Mr. Gorham's views were not contrary nor repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England, and he was instituted to the living, in spite of the Bishop of Exeter, under the fiat of the Archbishop of Canterbury. This judgment brought about the second great secession of last century from Canterbury to Rome.

Manning, with Pusey, Keble, and Gladstone, was foremost in vehement protest against "this awful work" of preferring an "unbelieving botanist?" Gladstone wrote: "If Mr. Gorham be carried through, and that upon the merits, I say not only is there no doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration in the Church of England as state interpreted, but there is no doctrine at all." Manning suggested secession from the Church. Gladstone, rather oddly, talked of retirement from politics by way of protest, and other men, less distinguished, went straight away to Rome. "Secessions rained like leaves," says Mr. Shane Leslie. But Manning still hesitated. To his friends who preceded him in their change of allegiance, he wrote affectionate letters, asking for their prayers. With Gladstone, in these last days of hesitation, he was in constant communication. Gladstone was then, as he remained till the day of his death many years afterwards, the most convinced and determined of Anglo-Catholics, and his point of view was summarised in a letter which he wrote in the summer of 1850 to Manning, in which he said: "Rome may be the last compulsory home of all who, in the west, at least, intend with God's help to hold by a definite revealed truth; but if it be so, a long and loud alas! for Christendom." Manning was incapable

of this confusion of mind, and he actually left the Church of England when he was ordered to attack the Church of Rome.

About the same time as the Gorham Judgment, came the Papal institution of the modern Roman hierarchy in England, and Queen Victoria, *Punch*, and the whole of Protestant England were aflame with indignation. The clergy of the diocese of Chichester met to register their protest. And the Archdeacon was expected to be their spokesman. The day before the meeting Manning resigned his office, and, though his brethren assembled "to confront the Archdeacon with his Roman tendencies," his sad dignity was so impressive that his opponents were silent. A contemporary writer says that "the pale, gentlemanly, quiet and melancholy Archdeacon commenced the proceedings by reading several prayers," and at the end there was a charming and a Christian vote of thanks. Five days afterwards, on a dull November evening, Manning preached his last sermon as an Anglican divine, and on December 5th, 1850, he left Lavington for good.

"Last Sunday," he wrote, "was a time of strange spiritual sorrow, a heaviness of soul such as I dare hardly speak of. Love, tenderness, long and fond memories of home and flock, were

around me and upon me. But through all a calm, clear conviction stood unmoved."

He discarded gaiters and shovel hat, bought lay clothes, and went to London, "without priest, without ephod, and without sacrifice." The final step was made infinitely painful for Manning by the break that it meant with Gladstone, with whom he had continued on close and affectionate terms since their undergraduate days, although the friendship had been somewhat affected by Gladstone's refusal publicly to proclaim the Anglo-Catholic indignation at the time of the Gorham Judgment. Gladstone never forgave Manning for his secession. When he heard of it, he said with characteristic exaggeration that he felt that his friend "had murdered his mother." And long afterwards he questioned Manning's sincerity.

Others of his Anglican friends were more understanding, among them the Duke of Newcastle, who wrote to him : "I mourn over what I must think the great error of a pure and noble mind, seeking the true light, but I cannot cease to love and admire the man who makes the sacrifices, which I know you have, in obedience to what he believes to be right." Manning always remembered the hard things said of him both before and after his conversion. And when years afterwards Liddon was accused of insincerity by a

Roman Catholic prelate, he said, "Do not say that. They used to say the same thing of me."

Manning went, and Gladstone remained ; just as Newman went and Pusey remained. And it is interesting, and, in a way, important, to understand the why and the wherefore. Manning himself believed that Gladstone was prevented from becoming a Roman Catholic by "invincible obstinacy." The truth is that, while accepting the full traditional Catholic faith, Gladstone, in common with most Englishmen of his generation and the generations that have followed, had an invincible distrust of the Papacy. He was a Catholic Liberal, though I do not think that he was a Liberal Catholic. His political followers were for the most part Nonconformist Protestants. He had a curiously subtle, and in some respects, a very arid mind. He was definitely insular ; horrified by the very suggestion of subjection to international authority ; so convinced that it would be a terrible tragedy if Rome were right and Canterbury were wrong that he persuaded himself that Canterbury must be right and Rome must be wrong. Gladstone was a politician, and it is difficult for the politician to forget politics, even when he is saying his prayers.

Nowadays every notable conversion to Rome is immediately followed by the publication of the

reasons for conversion, and the world knows exactly why the well-known novelist, the poet, the humorous priest, the talented young actor, are within the Roman fold. Perhaps the importance of their conversions is slightly exaggerated. But there can be no question of the importance in the religious history of the nineteenth century of the conversions of Newman and Manning, and if Gladstone had gone to Rome, there must have been something like a religious revolution.

It is clear from his subsequent history, and, indeed, from the story of the weeks and months that followed his decision, that when Manning went to Rome he went home. He became the naturalised citizen of his native country. And this is the main contrast between his life and the life of Newman, for wherever Newman was, he was something of an exile, and his biography might be called, "Here he had no abiding-place." There is a prophecy too of Manning's future ultramontanism in the fact that the event which finally determined him was condemned by a large and influential section of English Roman Catholic opinion. The institution of the hierarchy was regarded by the Roman Catholic peers as utterly ill-advised, calculated to aggravate Protestant prejudice and to make the lives of English Roman Catholics uncomfortable. They were, for the

most part, good, easy-going folk, asking for nothing more than to be let alone. In after years they were to be continually at loggerheads with the man who never could let people alone, and who found in the institution of the hierarchy a blow at Erastianism and a quickening of spiritual life.

It was in April 1851, in the church in the Buckingham Palace Road, which has, since the Russian Revolution, been lent by the Church of England to Russian refugees, that the two men parted. Five days later, with James Hope, Manning was received into the Church of Rome by Fr. Brownbill, a Jesuit. Newman was delighted. Pusey was as naturally heart-broken, though he did not fail in understanding. He wrote :

“ I only opened your letter in the train. I knew it was the close of many a heartache. I reproached myself, too, when I recollect how I had spoken to you of Purgatory in connection with the vision of St. Perpetua, when I since know St. Augustine sets its authority aside. It was a strange comfort to me when you told me the then barriers between you and Rome which I had broken down.”

Within ten weeks of his conversion, Manning was ordained priest and said his first Mass in Farm Street. He was promptly offered by

Newman the vice-rectorship in the Catholic University which he was endeavouring to establish in Dublin, and the failure of which nearly broke his heart. Perhaps because he astutely anticipated failure, perhaps because he felt the need for a period of quiet study and preparation, Manning declined the position, and this refusal, whatever may have been his reasons, was certainly extremely wise of him. He went to Rome, where he lived "as a sort of super-cargo in a college of priests."

In 1852 he was back again in England, and in that year he himself received seventeen converts into the Roman Church. But he did not succeed in converting Florence Nightingale, though she wavered for months on the brink of a decision, which, indeed, might have been made if the outbreak of the Crimean war had not given her the opportunity for the satisfaction of her great dominating personality.

England was in a frenzy of anti-Papalism when Manning made his submission to Rome. The institution of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, with the assumption of territorial titles by the Bishops, and the publication of Wiseman's first Pastoral as Archbishop of Westminster, caused an outburst of "no Popery" which had had no parallel since the Gordon riots. *The Times* denounced the

action of the Pope as an attempt “ to resume the absolute spiritual domination of this island which Rome has never abandoned but which by the blessing of Providence and the will of the English people she shall never accomplish.” *The Times* was the organ of the Tory Party, and it used Papal Aggression as an excuse for a bitter attack on the Whig Ministry of Lord John Russell, for the Pope had discussed the question of the hierarchy with Lord Minto, who had been sent by Palmerston on a diplomatic mission to Rome, and there had apparently been no official protest against the contemplated action.

Disraeli who “ cared for none of these things,” was, of course, quick to take advantage of the situation : “ The fact is,” he wrote, “ that the whole question has been surrendered, and decided in favour of the Pope, by the present Government ; and the Ministers who recognised the pseudo Archbishop of Tuam as a peer and a prelate cannot object to the appointment of a pseudo Archbishop of Westminster even though he be a Cardinal. On the contrary, the loftier dignity should, according to their table of precedence, rather invest His Eminence with a still higher patent of nobility, and permit him to take the wall of His Grace of Canterbury and the highest nobles of the land.”

Lord John Russell was terrified, and admitted that in the creation of the hierarchy there is "a pretension to supremacy over the realm of England and a claim to sole and undivided sway which is inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy, with the rights of our Bishops and clergy, and with the spiritual independence of the nation."

The old English Catholic families, always fearful of outbreaks of fanatical Protestantism, were affronted, and both the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Beaumont agreed that "ultramontane opinions are totally incompatible with allegiance to our sovereign and with our constitution." Gladstone and the Tractarians generally, and most of the extreme Liberals, defended the action of Rome as compatible with that religious freedom for which nineteenth-century Liberalism so emphatically stood.

And Manning, destined to be the defender of ultramontanism, came into a Church to be the defender of its extreme claims against the men whose loyalty to Rome had continued for centuries in face of persecution and penalty. From the beginning he was *plus royaliste que le roi*.

CHAPTER II

THE ULTRAMONTANE

Wiseman – his opinion of Manning – “ Widowers’ House ” – appointed Provost of the Westminster Chapter – opposition – succeeds Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster – views on Ireland – the Vatican Council of 1869 – made a Cardinal – refuses the Papal crown.

IN NOTHING was Manning more English than in his capacity for going from one extreme to the other. With his fine, sensitive mind, Newman became gradually convinced that there was no place for him in the Church of his birth, and for years after his conversion he had certain lingering doubts whether there was any place for him in the Church of his choice. He was compelled to the change of allegiance by the irresistible force of conviction, but he left old friends and old associations with bitter sorrow. Manning, on the other hand, left the Church of England immediately he began to doubt whether the Catholic claims made for the Church of England could be defended. He left certainly with relief, and almost, as it would seem, with a sort of fierce joy. In no man was the zeal of the convert ever more evident.

From the point of view of practical ecclesiastical politics, Manning was a far more valuable acquisition to Rome than Newman had been. He had many intimate associations with the most influential quarters, which he used wholeheartedly to promote the interests of the Church. He had not long to wait to prove his value. When the Crimean war broke out he persuaded the War Office, in face of bitter Protestant opposition, to permit Roman Catholic nuns to go out as nursing sisters, and to add considerably to the number of Roman Catholic chaplains. The situation bristled with difficulties, since the authorities at Rome objected to the Religious serving under the orders of Florence Nightingale, a lay woman and a heretic. The sisters more than justified themselves by their devotion, and relations were more or less amicable with the tempestuous and tyrannical Florence. Among the Roman Catholic nurses, who was not a Religious, was Mary Stanley, sister of the great Dean of Westminster, who served the wounded as efficiently as Miss Nightingale herself.

After the war, Manning and Miss Nightingale had a rather bitter dispute, and she wrote of him as “a decidedly clever fellow, who somehow or the other by foul more than by fair means gets all things his own way.”

From the beginning Cardinal Wiseman had fully appreciated Manning's potential value. He was an eloquent preacher, a wise and skilled confessor, with a knowledge of the great world that no other Roman Catholic priest in England could claim to possess. He was useful in a dozen ways, and an intimacy began between convert and Cardinal that increased with the years and lasted until Wiseman's death.

By birth Cardinal Wiseman belonged to the old Catholics, but he had lived for many years on the Continent and was without the inertia, the timidity, and the hatred of everything new that were the characteristics of the old Catholics as a whole. "Catholics of England seem to me to be in their politics like the Seven Sleepers," Manning wrote. "If anything they are Charles I Royalists, but there is no Charles I left."

The fame of Wiseman has suffered from comparison with the far greater fame of his successor, but he was a man of great parts. With abundant good humour and a wholesome English temperament that was anything but ascetic, he was also a considerable scholar and a first-rate controversialist. Mr. Denis Gwynn has written of Wiseman : "He was not the deep acute thinker that Newman was ; nor the masterful resourceful man of affairs that Manning was ; nor had he the

sound practical grip of men and things that Ullathorne had ; but in the combination of a richly endowed nature, and attractive lovable personality, and well-balanced, all-round character, and many-sided intellectual attainments, and successful achievement of a great life-work – in short, as a complete man, he surpassed them all.”

Wiseman was convinced that England was hurrying back to its old fealty to Rome. He had carefully watched the development of the Tractarian Movement, he had rejoiced over the conversion of Newman, and he had spent himself in endeavouring to mitigate the Protestant prejudice of the majority of his fellow-countrymen. At the same time, he appreciated the fears and difficulties of the old Catholics. He did not forget how, through many generations, they had suffered for their faith. But he realised the immense significance of the conversions and the priceless service that the converts, in their several ways, might render to the Church.

Manning, for whom half-measures were always impossible, was a little troubled by what seemed to him to be Wiseman’s regrettable patience with Gallicanism, and, astute as he was, he must have had some small fear that the Cardinal’s admiration for Napoleon III was not too healthy for the

Church. But in everything he proposed and in everything he did in the years during which he served the Cardinal, he never failed to find understanding and support. What Bishop, indeed, could fail in support of a priest who in two years brought two duchesses into the fold, despite the efforts of Pusey to retain one of them within the Anglican Communion ?

The Cardinal's own opinion of Manning was expressed in a letter written to Cardinal Barnabo in 1860 : "I do not hesitate to say, after a long summary of the many fruitful activities which Manning has initiated and carried through, that in all England there is not another priest who in double the time has done what Dr. Manning has for the advantage of the Catholic Church. Let your Eminence ask any who are hostile to him, is there any church or convent or school which they, I will not say have founded, but even suggested, and if they have ever converted even one learned man, such as Dr. Manning has many. If the activity of the one be contrasted with the inertness of the other, it will be easy to see which merits more to be encouraged in the Church of God : this generous activity which acts and gives without any limit, or the easy part of criticising and defaming works and words."

"Was such a man," the Cardinal asked, "to

be despised and treated as a man merely ambitious, cunning, dishonest, seeking nothing but his own interests and to gain influence?" In regard to Manning's private life, Wiseman declared that no one would dare to speak of his personal character without reverence. "As a preacher he ranks in my opinion as the first in England without any exception." Besides, he had in a special way the gift of converting others, so that clerks and laymen, the noble and the learned, went to him to declare their doubts and abjure their heresy. In regard to the poor, Manning had been almost alone in volunteering to assist the Cardinal in every undertaking.

With the Cardinal's permission, the Oblates of St. Charles, a society of secular priests with Manning at its head, settled in Bayswater. Among them was Herbert Vaughan, afterwards Cardinal, and Manning's successor. The majority were converts, and the old Catholics scornfully referred to the Bayswater settlement as "Widowers' House." It was not unnatural, indeed, that they should have been affronted (I quote from Shane Leslie) by "parsons providentially left single undertaking the general care of the Church." The "triumph of the converts" was not, however, attained without a storm of not ineffective opposition, which came to a head when Manning

was appointed Provost of the Chapter of Westminster, a position similar to that of an Anglican Dean. The leader of the old Catholics was Dr. Errington, Archbishop of Trebizonde, the Cardinal's coadjutor and therefore the recognised heir apparent to the Archiepiscopal throne. He was a determined single-minded man, a canonist of authority who had been suspicious of Manning from the first. And, thanks largely to Errington's influence, Manning found himself at the head of a definitely hostile Chapter, who attacked the constitution of the Oblates and endeavoured by every means to keep the distinguished convert in his place.

Manning had his enemies, but he had something like genius for finding useful friends, and, at this critical time in his life, the most useful of his friends was the Revd. the Hon. George Talbot, a younger son of Lord Talbot of Malahide, who had been converted in 1847 and lived in Rome as Chamberlain and confidant of Pope Pius IX. As is well known, Purcell founded his life of Manning mainly on the elaborate correspondence with Talbot, and Lytton Strachey's caricature almost entirely derives from Purcell's pages. Talbot was a busybody with a love of intrigue. He shared Manning's ultramontanism, and his impatience with the timidity of the English Catholics.

The fact that he died in a lunatic asylum has been made much of, but there is no reason whatever to doubt that his one concern was to serve the Church, nor can there be any doubt that, in strengthening Manning's position, he served the Church admirably well. Purcell is not unjustified in the suggestion that Manning used Talbot, whom he thoroughly understood, very astutely. "It did not require much time or trouble on the part of a man of such infinite tact and skill as Manning to gain supreme influence over Mgr. Talbot," writes Purcell. "If Mgr. Talbot had to see the Pope, the tongue which spoke in whispers was not Talbot's."

The suggestion, however, that the fourteen years from his conversion to Wiseman's death were spent by Manning in a protracted plot to secure his own preferment, and that he was little more than a rather ruthless careerist, is to misrepresent and misunderstand the man. From his experience outside the Church and from his acute understanding of his own people and his own time, Manning exactly understood what was needed if the Church of Rome were to have the smallest chance of winning England back to her ancient allegiance to Rome.

As time went on, he may have become more and more convinced that he himself was the only

person in England capable of successfully directing the Church's affairs, but that, in Manning's case, certainly meant the desire for efficient service and not merely the hunger for authority and power. And it is to be remembered that those who knew him best — men so various as Cardinal Vaughan and Lord Morley and Gladstone and W. T. Stead — were unanimous in their repudiation of what I may perhaps call the Purcell-Lytton Strachey caricature.

The pinpricks of Errington in the Westminster Chapter were reported by Manning to Rome, and Wiseman and Errington were summoned to the Vatican at Christmas 1859. The issue was clear. Errington and his friends wanted to hold their own. They stood for "safety first." Manning was all out for advance and for conquest.

After six months' consideration, during which time Manning had been sent for, the Pope decided against Errington. The battle had been fought and won. But Manning still had to face dislike and opposition in the Westminster Chapter, particularly from Canon Serle. Wiseman was now an old and sick man. Manning was constantly at his side and entirely in his confidence, and it has been quite correctly stated that Manning's reign really began in the autumn of 1860.

The contest between Manning the convert and the old Catholics led by Errington was to decide, as Manning said, "whether or no the Church in England shall content and confine itself to a better administration of Sacraments to the small communion of Catholic sojourners in England or shall mingle itself in the life of the English people, act upon its intelligence by a mature Catholic culture, upon its will by a larger and more vigorous exercise of the powers which are set in motion by the restoration of the hierarchy." The old Catholics were perfectly content to be an inconsiderable minority, tolerated because they made little or no attempt at proselytising. From the beginning of his Roman Catholic career, Manning, on the other hand, had the conversion of England always in his mind, and as one means towards that conversion he was eager that the Roman Catholic Church should exercise the fullest possible influence in every aspect of the nation's life. Because he was so characteristically English in so many of his qualities, he was truculently Catholic. Because he was truculently Catholic, hungry for progress, for numbers, and for power, he was ultramontane, for he realised that singleness of authority and complete subjection to it are necessary if an army, whether it be of the king or of the Lord, is to be assured of victory.

Wiseman backed him against Errington, and Rome was moved by the Cardinal for his support. Manning won, but he was saddened and depressed, and, indeed, bewildered by this dislike and misunderstanding.

With Errington barred from the succession, the obvious successor to Wiseman seemed to be Dr. Ullathorne, Bishop of Birmingham, who is best remembered for his long and most faithful friendship with Newman. Ullathorne was suggested by Manning to the Pope at the end of 1863. Wiseman did not approve of the suggestion. He disliked Ullathorne. The Cardinal, indeed, was growing very querulous, and the constant wrangles and suspicions and jealousies while his master was dying almost broke Manning's spirit. He thought, indeed, of giving up the struggle and retiring into a Benedictine monastery.

In February 1865, Wiseman died and Manning preached the sermon at his Requiem. In the course of an eloquent panegyric, he described the Cardinal as "our support, our strength, our guidance, our pattern and our pride," and he concluded :

"Bear him forth, right reverend Fathers and dear brethren in Jesus Christ ; bear him forth to the green burial ground on the outskirts of this busy wilderness of men. It was his desire to die

and to be buried, not amid the glories of Rome, but in the midst of his flock, the first Archbishop of Westminster. Lay him in the midst of that earth, as a shepherd in the midst of his sheep, near to the Holy Cross, the symbol of his life, work and hope ; where the pastors he has ordained will be buried one by one, resting in a circle round about him in death, as they laboured round about him in life. He will be among us still ; his name, his form, his words, his patience, his love of souls, will be our law, our rebuke, our consolation. And yet not so ; it is but the body of this death which you bear forth with tears of loving veneration. He is not here. He is already where the Great Shepherd of the sheep is numbering His elect, and those who led them to the fold of eternal life. And the hands which have so often blessed you, which anointed you for the altar, fed you with the Bread of Life, are already lifted up in prayer, unceasing day and night, for us one by one, for England, for the Church in all the world.”

The popular mourning for Wiseman was the proof of the change that had come over English public opinion in fourteen years, and of how thoroughly Wiseman had prepared the way for his successor. Gladstone and a host of other distinguished Anglicans paid their respect to the

dead while he lay in state in his house. Crowds lined the streets on the day of his funeral. "Everywhere," said *The Times*, "the cortège received marks of profound respect."

It was shortly before the death of Wiseman that Manning had the first of his differences with Newman. At the suggestion of Bishop Ullathorne, Newman had made plans for founding a Roman Catholic College at Oxford. The proposal had the support of the old Catholics, to whom by this time Newman had come to be regarded with a trust which they gave to no other of the converts. Manning was bitterly opposed to the scheme. He was determined to use every means to prevent young Catholics being educated in a definitely Anglican atmosphere, and he particularly, and rather oddly, feared the influence of Jowett. Moreover, the ultramontane suspected the Liberal Newman as "the centre of those who hold low views about the Holy See, are anti-Roman, cold and silent, to say no more, about the Temporal Power," and he even regarded Ullathorne as something of a Gallican. And, owing to Manning's influence in Rome, the proposal for an Oxford Oratory was prohibited, and Newman added one more to his experiences of disappointment.

Two years earlier, the publication of the

Apologia had ensured Newman his unchallengeable place among the great masters of English prose, and had made him for the first time a national figure. His magnificent self-defence was a subject for congratulation and rejoicing to Ullathorne, and, as Abbot Butler says, "to the Catholic body at large, clerical and lay." But Manning and his intimate friends saw nothing for praise in this great work. "I have read it with a mixture of pain and pleasure," wrote Herbert Vaughan; and Manning characterised Catholic enthusiasm for the *Apologia* as "literally playing the fool in this Kingsley affair."

It was the right of the Chapter of Westminster to send three names to Rome as suggested Archbishops, and the names they selected were those of Errington, Clifford, and Grant. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, had had many disagreements with Wiseman, and had been as vigorous as Errington in his opposition to Manning. Clifford, Bishop of Clifton, seems to have been a safe and rather colourless person who, it was said, had the backing of the Jesuits as well as of the British Government. Manning himself suggested seven names to Talbot. The first was Ullathorne, the last was Errington, the fifth was Newman. The succession was a matter of supreme importance, and quite properly there

was a long delay at Rome and endless consultations and hesitations. After a while Grant and Clifford withdrew, and it began to be whispered in the corridors that Manning would probably be the choice of His Holiness. It was quite certain that he would not permit the elevation of Errington. He was indignant indeed that his name had been suggested.

At last, in May, Pius IX made up his mind, and Manning, who had been scornfully called in *The Times* "an aspiring refugee," became the second Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster. He behaved with fine chivalry to the men who had for so long opposed him and misunderstood him, acknowledging in his return the charity he had received from the old Catholics of England.

Ullathorne, who had never been on cordial terms with Wiseman, warmly welcomed the new Archbishop. He wrote: "When I read the announcement I broke into a little laugh, and suddenly found a sort of lightening and expansion of the breast, which proved to me that I had been for some days under an unconscious pressure of care. I think that, under all circumstances, the Pope could not have done much better."

This attitude of the Bishop of Birmingham was particularly important, as his influence both

with the Bishops and the distinguished laity was very great, and Manning at once replied, expressing his gratitude, and adding how much he would in future rely on Ullathorne's friendly help.

Errington behaved with the dignity which never forsook him, refusing all offers of further preferment and retiring to the Isle of Man, where he lived and died as a simple priest.

The general feeling of the country was expressed by Sir George Jessel, Master of the Rolls, who wrote : "I believe there are few Englishmen, whatever their religious opinions, who will not esteem it a high compliment to their country that you have been called to fill so exalted a station."

Before taking over the duties of his high office, Manning made a retreat with the Passionists at Highgate, and the diary that he kept of this time is extremely illuminating. Here are some extracts :

" Being set upon such a height, I feel a fear that no words can express. If the Holy Ghost is so near me, so, I believe, is the spirit of evil. I feel as if the whole atmosphere around me were alive and astir with the enemies of my soul. It is certain that I shall be assailed more than any man. And my fall would be as when a standard-bearer falleth."

"By nature I am very irascible. Until the grace of God converted me, I was proud, cold and repulsive. Since then I hope less so, but I have always been cold and distant, except to those whom I personally love. It is on second thoughts that I dislike anyone."

"In one sense I have become less charitable, and I know I have become, or at least have been accused of imperiousness, presumptiveness, sharpness, suddenness and the like. But this has been inevitable. When I was in the system of compromise, I tried to mediate, to reconcile and unite together those who differed. When I entered a system, which, being Divine, is definite and uncompromising, I threw myself with my whole soul and strength into its mind, will and action. So it must be to the end. Less definite, positive, uncompromising, aggressive, I can never be. God forbid."

"Walking upon the terrace, and looking down upon London in the broad sunlight has been very moving to me. The Son of God would have wept over it. What beautiful souls are in it made in the likeness of God, with all the capacities of eternal life, but outcast, disinherited, darkened, stained, poisoned, distorted, disfigured, twice-dead."

Mr. Shane Leslie has pointed out that in this

same month, June 1865, when Manning from the heights of Highgate was brooding over London, William Booth was beginning his mission in Mile End.

Manning was consecrated Archbishop on June 8th by his Suffragan Bishops, Ullathorne, Clifford, and Grant, who had all been candidates for the Primacy. A writer who was present at the consecration said, "He looked like Lazarus come out of the tomb in cope and mitre, a richly vested corpse, but very dignified and placid. Dr. Newman was seen in the sacristy on his knees before the Archbishop, who hastened to raise him up and embrace him."

After he had left the English Church, in common with most converts, Manning lost all patience with Anglo-Catholics and Anglo-Catholicism, and as Archbishop he brought to a swift end the efforts towards reunion made by a society of Anglican clergy called the "Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom," the initials A.P.U.C. being translated by the irreverent as "A Plaster for Unquiet Consciences." Father Ignatius was a member of this association, as was Dr. Littledale, a scholar of repute, who was associated with *The Church Times*. The association seems to have been extraordinarily indiscreet, and

Manning's opposition to it was as unqualified and as successful as was, in after years, the opposition of his successors, Cardinal Vaughan and Cardinal Bourne, to the much more sagacious efforts for reunion of the late Lord Halifax. As for Anglo-Catholics generally, words could not convey the contempt he had for them. He analysed Pusey as "intellectually contradictory, obscene, suicidal, morally *skolios*, bitter, *pertinax*; ecclesiastically unlawful, foolish." And ritualism he rather wittily described as "private judgment in gorgeous raiment." He would provide no easy way to Rome. There must be complete subjection, unqualified acceptance of every Roman claim. Rome, to Manning, could make no concessions, no explanations. It was Divine, and must be accepted as Divine.

Manning, Mr. Shane Leslie has said, succeeded to "an Archbishopric without a cathedral, to a priesthood without a tridentine seminary and to a laity without schools." His first concern was for the children in his diocese, and particularly for the Irish children in London workhouses who were being brought up in the Church of England. He was concerned at the same time with the appointment of a Roman Catholic chaplain to every prison, for of the one hundred and twenty-five prisons in England, when he

succeeded Wiseman, only sixteen had such chaplains.

Manning was in Rome when W. E. Forster introduced the Education Act of 1870, which established School Boards and made primary education a national concern. The Archbishop, who really cared for education, astonished his brethren by giving the Bill a modified support. He believed that the excesses of Continental political extremists were due almost entirely to a Godless education, and it seemed probable that the School Boards would preserve in England the tradition of a Christian education, even though it might be partial and unsatisfactory. His primary duty was to preserve the Roman Catholic voluntary schools at all costs, and to secure for them, as was only just, a certain support from the public funds.

From the beginning the Archbishop dared to stand alone. He knew that he was by no means *persona grata* to his suffragans. But he had been chosen to rule by what to him was the highest authority on earth, and he intended to rule, and from the beginning he did rule with an iron hand, only calling his brethren to consultation once a year. The Bishops were more than restive. "Humble pie is a very good thing in its way now and then," said one of them, "but we may get too much of it even in Lent."

As an ultramontane and a fervent supporter of the Temporal Power, Manning had a deep abhorrence of Mazzini and all his works, but he had warm sympathy with Irish political aspirations, joining with Archbishop Cullen of Dublin in the early days of his Archiepiscopacy in the demand for the establishment of an Irish Catholic University and for the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. The position of the two ecclesiastics was, however, made extremely difficult by the outburst of Fenianism. "Show me an Irishman who has lost the Faith and I will show you a Fenian," said Manning in a public speech in 1867. This was, of course, as Mr. Shane Leslie has said, quite untrue, for one of the bewildering features of Irish history is the fact that men of fervent faith and sincere piety have constantly been guilty of political crime.

Gladstone was returned to power in 1868 with the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland in the forefront of his programme. The Archbishop and the statesman had been in constant touch before the election, and Manning had acted as intermediary between Gladstone and the Irish hierarchy. Manning's own opinion was expressed in 1865 :

"I am convinced that we hold Ireland by force, not only against the will of the majority, but in

violation of all rights, natural and supernatural — that is, of political justice and of religious conscience. Moreover, that our bayonets there are as truly foreign bayonets as the French in Rome. Against a status of six hundred years I put one of a thousand. *Explicit controversarum Liber !*"

Despite his horror of the Fenians, Manning remained a Home Ruler, and he insisted that the well-being of the Irish nation depended on the provision of a higher education which should be essentially Christian and Catholic. He wrote to Gladstone :

" Believe me, the only hope of restoring Ireland to social order and peace is to give free course to the only powers of Christianity which control it. Weaken these in the upper classes, as they have been by various causes weakened in the lower, and you will have to deal with '98 over again. A true, full, unimpeded Catholic education is the only hope I know of keeping Ireland from American anarchy."

A Roman Catholic Archbishop has many international as well as national interests and responsibilities, and a crisis was approaching in the Church which absorbed Manning's attention and caused him for a while to forget Ireland and not to think over-persistently of Westminster. In 1867 Manning was in Rome with five hundred

other Bishops to celebrate St. Peter's martyrdom, and to the assembly Pius IX announced his intention of calling a General Council, the first since the Council of Trent. The main intention of the Council was solemnly to promulgate the doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

From the moment of his conversion, Manning had been a convinced ultramontane. He believed that the retention of the Temporal Power was essential for the well-being of the Church. In 1864 he wrote that for him the Temporal Power was the "nexus between the revelation of God's Truth and Law and the civil society of the world." He believed in the Temporal Power because "a subject Pope is no Pope" and a national Pope would be a nuisance. On the question of Infallibility he was equally emphatic, here once more being in vivid contrast to Newman, who at the end of the 'sixties was filled with doubts and fears.

It is interesting to note that Manning and the majority of the Roman Catholic converts in England were more ultramontane even than Pope Pius IX himself. In 1863, Montalambert delivered a lecture at Malines on liberty of conscience which was hotly denounced by W. G. Ward, Manning's friend, in the *Dublin Review*. But Montalambert was afterwards assured that

the Vatican did not regard his lecture as open to censure.

The Council assembled in Rome in 1869. Manning, speaking for England, although certain of the Bishops and a large percentage of the laity disagreed with him, was emphatic for Infallibility. His chief supporter was Ward, a layman, who was described as "the theocrat at the breakfast table." His most influential English opponent was Newman, who was, as usual, guarded and reticent, but whose opinions were, again as usual, very well known. Newman was invited to the Council, but he declined. "I am not fitted either by my talents or by my attainments," he said. "No one would gain by my being there, and I am not at all sure I should not lose my life." Although Infallibility was supported by the French Statesmen, Thiers and Guizot, the opposition was led by the French prelate Dupanloup, Archbishop of Orleans, who was backed by the majority of the French Bishops, Gallicanism being by no means dead. And immediately before the opening of the Council it was confidently anticipated that Fallibility would triumph. In the early days of 1870, apart from the Italian Bishops, there was a definite majority against the proposed Infallibility decree, and the official history of the Council

certainly suggests that it is unlikely that it would have been finally approved had it not been for the restless energy of the Archbishop of Westminster, still in the early years of his life as a Roman Catholic, but feverishly intent on making history.

While Manning was using to the full his genius for persuasion, and perhaps for intrigue, for the promulgation of the Infallibility decree, another English Roman Catholic, Lord Acton, whom Gladstone had persuaded to go to Rome, was equally energetic on the other side. Lord Odo Russell, the British Ambassador in Rome, wrote to the Government of Manning :

“ The love of domination is about him, and when his thin lips smile, it seems to be out of pure condescension. He is certainly pious and sincere, wrapped in God, but he is not the emaciated monk he looks. Under his seraphic beatitude he retains a wheedling and energetic policy.”

Napoleon III actively intervened in opposition to the decree, threatening that if it were promulgated the French troops would be withdrawn from Rome and the Eternal City left to the mercy of the Italian Nationalists. Austria backed France. Döllinger, the famous German theologian, organised German opposition. Gladstone,

the friend of Döllinger, was prevented by his colleagues from making any open expression of hostility, but he let the mind of the Government be clearly known.

Manning made a great speech in reply to the Archbishop of Paris, and so swayed the Council that a few days afterwards Acton left Rome, knowing that the fight was over. On July 13th, 1869, four hundred and eighty-one prelates voted in favour of Infallibility, but Manning was the only Englishman among them. On July 17th the number had risen to five hundred and thirty-five. A number abstained, but only two voted against, and all those who abstained subsequently accepted Infallibility "as the voice of the Church and as such undoubtedly true." Döllinger, and Döllinger alone, refused to submit.

Writing afterwards of the proceedings of the Council, Manning said :

"The Opposition Bishops were damaged by the support of Döllinger and Friedrich, and in some of them the same spirit of supercilious science, with contempt of others, showed itself. Their Parliamentary canvassing, and boasting, and defiance, and I must add intrigue, to sway Pius IX, and to bring the pressure of the Civil Powers upon the Pope and the Council, were well known to me. I knew Acton to be their

servant. All this was known to me in Rome, at the time, and I have the record and proof of it in a series of letters from Odo Russell, then in Rome, with whom I had close communication."

As Purcell says, "the Vatican Council was the index hand which marked the culminating point in Cardinal Manning's career." At Rome, the man who had only been nineteen years within the Church was the commanding and dominating figure.

The Infallibility decree itself was very moderately worded. It claimed for the Pope "that Infallibility with which the Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals." As Mr. Bernard Shaw wrote in the Preface to *Saint Joan* : "Perhaps I had better inform my Protestant readers that the famous Dogma of Papal Infallibility is by far the most modest pretension of the kind in existence. Compared to our infallible democracies, our infallible medical councils, our infallible astronomers, our infallible judges, and our infallible parliaments, the Pope is on his knees in the dust confessing his ignorance before the throne of God, asking only that as to certain historical matters on which he has clearly more sources of information open to him than anyone else his decision shall be taken as final."

It was specifically stated that it is only when he speaks *ex cathedra* that the Pope is infallible, and it has been held by eminent canonists, including Newman, that the authority of the Pope in matters of doctrine is only infallible when the Pope specifically states that he is imposing on the faithful an obligation to believe under pain of heresy and all its consequences. And it is important to remember that no infallible decree has been issued by the Vatican since 1870. It is indeed always the policy of Rome, as was said at the time by one of the Italian Cardinals, that, while the Church is rigid in the proclamation of its laws, in their application it always takes into consideration "the natural weaknesses of mankind."

Nothing is perhaps more remarkable in the history of 1870 than the promptness with which the Opposition prelates loyally accepted the findings of the majority. Ullathorne, who had been hesitant all through the proceedings of the Council, much to Manning's irritation, wrote, when he returned to Birmingham, "that if the formal definition of the Papal Infallibility is new, the doctrine is not new; it is as old as the Christian religion and has ever lived in the practical sense of the Church. To deny it before it was defined was considered as being near to heresy; to deny it after its definition is to fall into actual heresy."

The decree was accepted by the Roman Church without any great protest, and with the smallest number of important secessions. World events indeed deprived the decision of much of its contemporary importance. The war between France and Germany had begun before the Council came to an end. The French troops were withdrawn from Rome, Victor Emmanuel marched into Papal territory, and Rome was included in the new united kingdom of Italy. "Almost in the same moment," says Lytton Strachey, "the successor of St. Peter had lost his Temporal Power, and gained Infallibility."

To Manning the Temporal Power had a vast spiritual significance. He denounced the invaders of Rome - Italians, be it remembered, occupying an Italian city - as public malefactors, and, for once ceasing to be a realistic politician, he urged English intervention, suggesting to Gladstone that the English navy should bombard Italian ports unless the Pope's sovereignty was restored. Gladstone went so far as to send a ship to Civita Vecchia, ordering that "should the Holy Father request to be taken on board, he is to be received and treated with all respect." Gladstone, too, rather oddly, while recognising that Rome could not be excluded from a united Italy, expressed the hope that it should not be

made the capital. As for Manning, he was horrified that "a multitude of women entered Rome with the army," and that "Protestant Bibles, bad books and pictures and a translation of *Lothair* were sold in the streets some time after the capitulation."

It is interesting to recall that it was suggested that the Pope, now to become for sixty years the prisoner in the Vatican, should find refuge in either Malta or Jerusalem. If this proposal had been accepted – if, that is, the Pope had forgotten that he owes his Primacy to the fact that he is Bishop of Rome – the history of Christendom in the last two generations must certainly have been vastly different. Manning urged that, since there were then a hundred and ten sees and Bishops in the British Empire, the question of the political independence of the Pope had a direct interest for the British Government. To-day it is a question of even greater interest to the Government of the United States, with its vast Roman Catholic population. And in the Italian Abyssinian dispute there has been a tragically dramatic demonstration of the impossibility of the head of the Roman Catholic Church making the fullest possible use of his unrivalled international moral influence from the fact that he is an Italian and the holder of an Italian see.

Manning was logical. He recognised that ultramontane authority could not be exercised by a Pontiff who was a subject of a secular State. This is obviously true, although the moral authority of the Papacy certainly increased after 1870, the Popes repudiating the secular authority of the Italian State. Temporal Power was nominally restored by Signor Mussolini with the signing of the Lateran Treaty. But such Temporal Power as the Pope again possesses could at any time be destroyed by a platoon of Italian infantrymen. It has nothing but sentimental value, and to the outsider not very much of that. The Pope remains an Italian Bishop, and, being an Italian Bishop, it is infinitely difficult for him openly to express international condemnation of any action of the Italian Government.

Manning was convinced that Temporal Sovereignty would ultimately be regained. He was entirely opposed to the notion that it could be or should be regained by force. "The strength of the Holy See is to be unarmed."

In the whirl of world events, the loss of Temporal Power and the claim to Infallibility were calmly accepted by the faithful, but Infallibility aroused the wrath and misgivings of earnest men outside the Roman obedience. In one of his

periodical retirements from politics, Gladstone wrote a pamphlet in which he declared that the claims of the Pope were incompatible with the rights of the Crown and the liberties of the people. Manning at once replied in a long letter to *The Times*, in which he declared that "the civil allegiance of every Christian man in England is limited by conscience and the Law of God; and the civil allegiance of Catholics is limited neither more nor less." Manning declared that the publication of Gladstone's *Vaticanism* was the first event that had overcast a friendship of forty-five years. Gladstone promptly replied that the friendship had practically come to an end at the time of Manning's conversion. To which the Archbishop commented: "My act in 1851 may have overcast your friendship for me; it did not overcast my friendship for you." His long correspondence with Gladstone on the Irish question completely justified him. Years afterwards he said: "From the way in which Gladstone alluded to the overcasting of our friendship, people might have thought that I had picked his pocket."

In 1875 Manning became a Cardinal. He was the first converted Anglican clergyman to receive the honour, and he had become so great a national figure that the action of the Pope was warmly

appreciated in the Press and by the public. Newman wrote his congratulations. Gladstone was silent.

In 1877 the Cardinal went to Rome to receive the hat from the hands of the Pope, and, a few days afterwards, Pio Nono died. He was eighty-six, and had occupied the Papal throne for thirty-two years. At the conclave for the election of his successor, Manning could, if he would, have himself become the supreme Pontiff. His candidature was urged by Cardinal Bilio, who swayed the majority of the votes. But Manning declined, on the ground that the loss of the Temporal Power made it absolutely necessary that the next Pope should be an Italian, who would "draw Italy to him as Pius drew the whole world." And it was largely owing to his influence that Cardinal Pecci succeeded Pius IX as Leo XIII. This is important because Leo XIII was a liberal, and his election meant the end of the ultramontanism of which Manning was the consistent and vehement supporter.

CHAPTER III

THE PEOPLE'S CARDINAL

Interest in social problems - relations with contemporaries - puritanical ideas - sympathy with Labour - formulates a Christian sociology - settles dock strike of 1889 - views on Home Rule - member of Royal Commissions on Housing and Education.

FOR ten years Manning was a great international influence. He swayed a Council and a Conclave. He might have been Pope. When he refused the triple crown, he stepped off the international stage. While Pius IX reigned, Manning was "the Italian Englishman," insistent for Infallibility and the Temporal Power, adept in Vatican intrigue. When Leo XIII succeeded, Manning became again a very English Englishman, concerned with the well-being of the Roman Church in England for which he was responsible to God, but almost equally concerned with every aspect of contemporary English life. It is interesting to speculate as to what would have happened if Manning had listened to Cardinal Bilio and had been elected by the Conclave. Would the Government of united Italy have tolerated a foreign Pontiff in Rome? What would have been the attitude of the British Government to a

British subject raised to the most influential position on earth? The selection would have been revolutionary and might well have caused a revolution in the Church. Certainly the history of the Church and of Christendom during the past fifty years would have been vastly different from what it has been. But the fundamentalist English Cardinal returned to London, and the Liberal Italian Pope set himself to retrenchment and reform, to the founding of schools and the teaching of the Thomasine philosophy, to the writing of encyclicals instinct with understanding of his times, to many dreams including that of the return of Canterbury to Rome.

Italy ceased to interest Manning. The Temporal Power which he had acclaimed as necessary for the salvation of the world had gone. Let it go! He accepted the new conditions in the spirit of realistic statesmanship. His business was to protect the Church in the new circumstances as the Church and Christianity demanded.

At seventy, Manning was a prominent figure in English political and intellectual life, exercising a far greater influence behind the scenes than any Roman Catholic had exercised since the Reformation. His nation-wide popularity was still to be won. But already "the Cardinal" was

almost as familiar to the wayfarer as "Dizzy" or the "G. O. M." and far more familiar than their Graces of Canterbury and York. It was his sympathy with the oppressed and his ever-growing interest in social problems that made Manning famous and have given him his unique position among nineteenth-century ecclesiastics. In nothing does Lytton Strachey demonstrate his complete failure to understand Manning and to realise his significance more than in the fact that he dismisses the main pre-occupation of the Cardinal's last twelve years in a couple of pages, apparently regarding it as the eccentricity of approaching senility.

He was invited to serve on Royal Commissions ; he was given precedence at public functions ; he played an important part in social and political life. His relations with the Royal Family, and particularly with the Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII, were constant and cordial. By the force of personality, he gave the Roman Catholic Church an important and recognised position in English life. Of course this achievement aroused the usual Protestant fanatical protests, and I cannot forbear quoting from Mr. Shane Leslie one of the letters addressed at this time to the Cardinal :

"Sir, If you think you will be allowed to take

social precedence of the Protestant nobility, you greatly deceive yourself. Your first attempt is already watched. I allude to your name appearing at the head of the patrons of a proposed Cab and Cab-horse Competition at the Alexandra Palace."

Manning was keenly concerned with international affairs. Convinced as he was that he was a Prince of the Church Catholic, he was still an intensely patriotic Englishman, and as he grew older he became a definite Imperialist, and was accused, not altogether unfairly, of being something of a Jingo. While serving his Church, opportunities often occurred for serving his country. One typical example happened in 1885. Considerable irritation had been caused for years in India by the appointment of Portuguese Bishops, nominated by the Portuguese Government, to the See of Goa. Manning wrote to the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, a very candid letter, in which he said :

“ Great and serious evils have arisen during the last half century as a result of this claim on the part of Portugal. It has imported into British India a conflict of ecclesiastical jurisdictions, followed by much religious dissensions. It has hindered the spiritual offices of the Church among the Goanese populations, scattered in part through

British India, whose religious condition stands in need of much correction and elevation. It has introduced among them many ecclesiastics, of whom, to say at least, the conduct is very unsatisfactory, and I must add unworthy."

So the Portuguese Bishops went, and English Bishops took their place.

While he ruled his own kingdom despotically, permitting no criticism and rarely asking counsel, Manning was, indeed, in intimate touch with political and intellectual life, and in constant consultation with the authorities of the State. Disraeli has left a picture of him in his novel *Lothair*.

"Above the middle height, his stature seemed magnified by the attenuation of his form. It seemed that the soul never had so frail and fragile a tenement. He was dressed in a dark cassock with a red border, and wore scarlet stockings ; and over his cassock a purple tippet, and on his breast a small golden cross. His countenance was, naturally, of an extreme pallor, though at this moment slightly flushed with the animation of a deeply interesting conference. His cheeks were hollow, and his grey eyes seemed sunk into his clear and noble brow, but they flashed with irresistible penetration."

When Disraeli succeeded Gladstone in 1875, the Cardinal, who always professed that he was

neither Whig nor Tory, was a frequent correspondent of the new Prime Minister and his Cabinet, and their relations may be gathered from a letter written to the Cardinal in 1879 :

Hughenden Manor,
31st December, 1879.

MY DEAR LORD CARDINAL — Your kind wishes to me for the New Year touch me much, and I reciprocate them with a perfect cordiality. In the dark and disturbing days on which we have fallen, so fierce with faction even among the most responsible, the voice of patriotism from one so eminent as yourself, will animate the faltering, and add courage even to the brave. — Believe me, with deep regard, yours,

BEACONSFIELD.

The Cardinal joined the pious Protestants in an onslaught on Bradlaugh, and by so doing, as Lord Shaftesbury had anticipated, gave Bradlaugh something like the halo of the martyr. He was an active member of the Metaphysical Society, at the meetings of which he met and contended with such men as Huxley, Hutton, Lubbock, Froude, Dean Stanley, and Martineau. Many of his fellow Roman Catholics, Newman

among them, were a little shocked by this sitting down with unbelievers, but Manning was too firm in the faith to be fearful of the arguments of his opponents.

Carlyle refused to meet him. He disliked Froude, who, he said, possessed "a physical incapacity to tell the truth." But he was on terms of pleasant friendship with Tennyson and Ruskin, and even with Frederic Harrison the Positivist. Positivism, he once said, was "a noble torso from which the head had been cut." On one occasion the Metaphysical Society met in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster Abbey, and Manning, who was in the chair, began the proceedings with the remark, "The last time a Catholic Archbishop sat in this chair it was Cardinal Pole."

He read widely, and his criticisms were individual and suggestive. He described the *La Dame Aux Camélias* as "transfigured profligacy and unchastity in haloes." The Dickens novels were "a complete course of moral theology," and Coventry Patmore's poems "a green field after the gaudy harlequin diction of modern writers."

The Cardinal was always sure of a good Press, and he was on cordial terms with a number of prominent journalists, who included George Augustus Sala, at that time the most prominent

member of the staff of the *Daily Telegraph*. All his life he warred with *The Times*, which he concluded was "largely written by undergraduates." His friendship with W. T. Stead, the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, to which further reference will be made, did not begin until well into the 'eighties. The Cardinal was the most popular of speakers at charity meetings, and was by courtesy given precedence before peers of the realm.

Governing, speaking, negotiating, did not exhaust the energies of this austere, ascetic man approaching his seventieth year. He was, in addition, the author of several books, the best known of which is *The Eternal Priesthood*, which was followed by two sequels.

Manning was an enthusiastic and almost fanatical teetotaler. In an autobiographical note that he wrote in 1890, he said :

"The Constitution of England is a Catholic structure inherited from our fathers, and must be jealously guarded by Catholics. But three plagues are destroying the people : (1) The land laws since Henry VIII and Charles II. (2) The relations of Capital and Labour during the last hundred years of selfish Political Economy. (3) The Drink Trade, which has been fostered by Capitalists and favoured by Government for the sake of Revenue."

In his zeal for the temperance cause, he was unable to carry the majority of his people with him, and he was frequently criticised, particularly in the correspondence columns of the *Tablet*. He himself admitted :

“ In the Total Abstinence movement the aspiration of our people has been higher than that of the clergy. The chief discouragement has come from priests. Every bishop knows the scandals and sorrows he has in priests, not only in drunkards, but in those who are never seen to be drunk but are lowered in mind and soul by suspected and unsuspected drink. And yet some will not move. I have deliberately made myself ‘ a fool for Christ’s sake ’ in this matter, and set my face as a flint. When I thought in Paris that I might never come back in 1877, one of my happiest thoughts was that we had saved many poor drunkards ! I hope whosoever comes after me will have the courage to face the criticism of not the fools only but the half-hearted wise.”

Manning was “ a Puritan under the purple.” His denunciations of “ the drink ” reek of the conventicle. In one of his letters to Fr. Mathew, the famous Irish temperance leader, for example, he wrote : “ If we were ever on God’s side in a battle, it is now when we are giving up our Christian liberty for the salvation of souls.” He

was equally an old-fashioned Puritan in his denunciation of the theatre. He wrote :

“ I cannot believe that the excitement, the publicity, the promiscuous intercourse, the emotions, the scenes, the sights, the music, the sympathy, and the animal magnetism of imagination and feeling, can be kept up for hours without danger to the unconscious purity of the senses and of the soul. Some deny this, but more, and they wiser and calmer minds, acknowledge it. All this even when the play is good. I have watched the Divorce Court, and have found that, I may say in a majority of cases, directly or indirectly, the co-respondents are of the theatrical world. The promiscuous consort of men and women behind the scenes, and the dramatic intimacies and embraces on the stage, and the impersonation of lovers and the like, must react upon the emotions and passions, whether men and women will it or no. Furthermore, every theatre is a centre of all kinds of evil. It creates a population which lives by vice. The whole surrounding neighbourhood is tainted. The multitudes that flock there every night are caught as in a whirlpool, and many ‘ go down live into the pit.’ ”

This passage with its absurd exaggeration throws a singular sidelight on the character of a

man usually not difficult to understand. In his relations with politicians and with the Princes of the Church, Manning could be a subtle man of the world. But behind all this was an overwhelming anxiety for the salvation of souls and a fierce hatred of everything that seemed to him to threaten that salvation, a hatred which in the case of the theatre was stimulated by an extraordinarily complete ignorance. He forbade nuns to let their pupils perform plays in convent schools. He forbade parish priests to augment their funds with bazaars. "A bazaar," he wrote, "would bring dry rot into the timbers of a mission." He expected his priests to be teetotalers, which most of them were not, and never to go to a theatre, an order which was generally obeyed.

Much to the embarrassment of his flock, Manning publicly and enthusiastically supported W. T. Stead in his attack in the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the white slave traffic, which he denounced as "Satan's international." No one doubted Stead's good intentions, but his methods were certainly open to criticism, and this criticism was frankly expressed in the columns of the *Tablet*, and Manning confessed that "in the uprising against the horrible depravity which destroys young girls, multitudes of ours, I was literally denounced by Catholics." Stead was sent to

prison, and Manning wrote to him : " All things work together for good for them that love God. You have served Him with a single eye." Stead's crusade had its practical results, for the revelations in the *Pall Mall Gazette* caused the passing by Parliament of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, which raised the age of consent, and has been an effective protection for young girls.

Although the British Government had no official representative at the Vatican and there was no Papal Nuncio at the Court of St. James's, as I have noted in the case of the Council of 1870 and the selection of a Dublin Archbishop, the British Government constantly attempted to influence the decisions of the Holy See. Manning resented these attempts, and was emphatic that there should be no formal representation. In the new circumstances of the world Manning, indeed, believed that the office of Nuncio should be entirely abolished. He wrote in a memorandum that he left behind at his death :

" The true Nuncio in every nation is the Episcopate. Let the Holy See, which names it, trust it and consult it, and control it by letter calling it to Rome.

" If the Holy See will govern through the Episcopate, it can do anything. If it endeavour to govern without it, or outside of it, or over its

head, let those who advise such a policy be responsible. I apply this to all countries. I have in writing and in words told Leo XIII : 'There is one power in Ireland that can govern the Irish people - that is the Irish Bishops ; and there is one power upon earth that can govern the Irish Bishops, and that is your Holiness.' But this must be through and not outside. If the Holy See will govern with, by, and through the Episcopate, one whole race of men would disappear - the whisperers, intriguers, backbiters, and accusers."

But oppressed though he was "by the evils of drink" he was far too shrewd an observer not to realise that excessive drinking was to a large extent the result of degrading social conditions as often as it was their cause, and the condition of the people in England was ever in his mind. Long before he left the Church of England he foresaw the coming of great social changes, and he fully realised the inhumanity of the conditions approved and to an extent created by the Manchester School. As early as 1872 he attended a meeting at Exeter Hall and proposed a motion of sympathy with the agricultural labourer. Subsequently, writing to Gladstone, he said :

"Why cannot you do these things for the labourer? Prohibit the labour of children under

a certain age. Compel payment of wages in money. Regulate the number of dwellings according to the population of parishes. Establish tribunals of arbitration in counties for questions between labour and land. If our unions were like the guilds, which created the City of London, I should not fear them. But the *soul* is not there."

In 1874 he made a speech at Leeds on the Dignity and Rights of Labour. In the concluding passages he said :

"I have endeavoured to draw out before you what is the dignity of labour. It is the law of our state, the law of our development and perfection, the source of invention, the power of creation and the cause of manifold capital in money and in skill. And as to its rights, I have shown that it is true property, true capital; that it has a primary right of freedom, a right to protect itself, and a claim upon the law of the land to protect it. I will only add that there can be nothing in a working man undignified unless he himself is the cause of it. Forgive me if I use a very common proverb and if I make another like it : 'An idle man is the devil's playfellow'; and 'An intemperate man is the devil's slave.' As to the rights, I know nothing that can ever limit the rights of a working man excepting his committing

wrong. If he commits wrong, the strong may retaliate ; if he does no wrong, the supreme power of the law will protect him."

And he went on :

" The science of morals rests on four foundations – on prudence, which guides the intellect ; on justice, which guides the will ; on temperance, which governs the passions ; and on fortitude, which sustains the whole man in the guidance and government of himself. These four cardinal virtues of the natural order perfect the character of man ; and to-night I am not speaking in any other sense. They underlie all the dignity of man, and they justify all his rights. The labourer in our common field of toil who is prudent, just, temperate, and brave is, indeed, ' a workman that needeth not to be ashamed.' "

Manning once described himself as a " Mosaic Radical." Mr. Shane Leslie has taken pains to show that he was a Mosaic Radical long before he was a Roman Catholic. He had corresponded with Maurice, who, with Charles Kingsley, was one of the leaders of the Broad Church social reformers, and had bluntly denounced the greed of the rich in his charges as Archdeacon of Chichester.

Manning was always a man of undaunted courage. When England was enthusiastic for

Italian freedom and unity, he hotly denounced Garibaldi. Now he offended the comfortable of his own communion and the world outside it by becoming the champion of the poor. Many reasons have been suggested for Manning's refusal of the Papacy. Lytton Strachey, always eager for a gibe, remarks that "the cautious hand restrained." But it is at least permissible to believe that he was already convinced that the business of the years that were left to him was to care for "the outcast, disinherited darkness, stained, poisoned, distorted, disfigured" of his own land.

However this may have been, immediately on his return from the Conclave, Manning subscribed to the funds of the agricultural labourers' trade union, founded by Joseph Arch, whom the Anglican Bishop of Gloucester wanted ducked in a horse-pond.

In 1886, Henry George, the American social reformer, stood for election as Mayor of New York. In 1879 George had published his famous book *Progress and Poverty*, in which he had advocated the "single tax," a tax on land which was to have meant, in effect, land nationalisation with confiscation. George found considerable support among the Irish-American Catholic laity, and from some prominent priests, and the result was a bitter controversy in the Roman Catholic

Church in which Manning was indirectly concerned. He had met George in London, and had discussed his proposals with him. Catholic sociology has as its basis the principle of private property. The Catholic sociologist demands that every man shall own something, and equally with the Socialist he condemns the social system that gives a few men everything and the great majority nothing. But the Catholic cannot be a Socialist. In his conversation with Henry George, Manning said :

“ Before we go any further, let me know whether we are in agreement upon one vital principle. I believe that the law of property is founded on the law of nature and that it is sanctioned in revelation, declared in the Christian law, taught by the Catholic Church and incorporated in the civilisation of all nations.”

Manning, who had not read *Progress and Poverty*, thought that George accepted the Catholic doctrine, though he certainly did not. Indeed, some two or three years later, Archbishop Walsh pointed out to Manning that the difference between George's land policy and the policy of the Irish Land League was that the League accepted the principle of compensation and therefore its demands were not incompatible with the teaching of the Church.

Manning misunderstood George, and George misunderstood the Cardinal. In the course of the New York election, one of his supporters said :

“ Surely it will be admitted that Cardinal Manning is an authority on doctrine and discipline. He informed Mr. George that he saw nothing in his teachings to condemn, and when Mr. George stated that others had condemned them as morally and theologically wrong, the Cardinal remarked that they were unauthorised and incompetent critics.”

The use of the Cardinal’s name was a considerable embarrassment to the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in America, particularly as Manning’s well-known sympathy with Irish Home Rule had given him an authority with the masses in the American cities that no Englishman had then or has ever had since. But this Henry George incident led to the beginning of an intimate association with Cardinal Gibbons, who, himself, declined any wholesale condemnation of *Progress and Poverty*, which was to have an immensely important consequence in Rome.

Manning shared Ruskin’s suspicion of political economy and the political economist. He wrote to *The Times* in 1886 :

“ The Good Samaritan did not delay to pour oil and wine into the wounds of the man half

dead until he had ascertained whether he was responsible for his own distress."

He did not, however, believe that the problem of unemployment could be solved by private charity. He had his own practical suggestions of which one was a scheme for Empire settlement. He wrote :

"Colonization requires that men and families in groups, combining artisans and agricultural workmen, and provided with the means of self-help and of settling themselves in ordered societies, should be transferred, under the direction of Government, to unoccupied lands in our boundless Empire, where provision shall have been already made for their reception. The funds for such colonization need not be derived from grants of Imperial taxation, but from loans secured on the lands granted or sold to the colonists. By this extension of our mother country both those who go and those who stay at home are benefited ; new fields of industry and new markets for commerce are added to our Commonwealth. The distress of a winter would then issue in the permanent welfare of multitudes who, pent up at home, destroy our social prosperity and are themselves destroyed."

Manning had earned for himself the title of the Friend of the Poor, and the Pope listened "with

his gentle smile, which always seems to mean half consent and half fear," when Gibbons explained to him that the aim of the English-speaking Cardinals was "recognising the inevitable tendency to democracy, not to leave it to be ruled by the devil, but to hold it in the ways of God."

The years from 1885 to 1890 were a period of industrial unrest in England. H. M. Hyndman's Social Democratic Federation and William Morris's idealist Socialist League were busy with propaganda and agitation, and Hyndman urged Manning to follow the example of the Comte de Mun in France and endeavour "to stave off the relentless class war which is impending in this England of ours."

Perhaps in answer to this challenge, Manning set himself to determine the bases of a Catholic sociology. In 1888 he wrote several letters to *The Times*. He began by hotly denying that he had advocated, as the trade unions demand now, that "every deserving person who is unemployed has a right to be provided by the community with work at the current rate of wages." He had been attacked by Robert Griffen, the statistician, and accused of advocating the establishment of national workshops on the French Revolution model. He specifically repudiated adherence to any form of Socialism. He went on, quoting John

Stuart Mill and Henry Fawcett, to insist on those "rights" of the poor that are "founded in the universal Christian law as well as in the law of nature." He said :

" The poor who possess neither land nor capital have the right of nature to life and to the sustenance of life ; but the able-bodied and the skilful possess the power and the skill of labour, which is true and living capital. The aged and impotent cannot work. The law of nature gives them, as Mr. Mill and Mr. Fawcett say, a right to work or to sustenance without work. Whether this right be only natural, or also legal, as it is happily in England, it binds all who possess the property which human law recognises and protects. The English Poor Law, therefore, is a law of natural justice, having a Divine sanction, creating rights in the poor and duties in the rich. The Poor Law is as a rent-charge upon the inheritance of England in behalf of the younger children for whom there is no legacy in the will ; the elder sons inherit the real property in Land and others the personality in money. The poor possess nothing but their inheritance of natural right. If the Poor Law of Elizabeth had not been passed the English Land Laws would scarcely have survived until this day. From Henry VIII till Charles II the possession of land had been passing

from the many to the few. In proportion to the population it was never held in so few hands as at this day. The yeomen and the statesmen and the forty-shilling freeholders are gone: It is a grave danger to treat the natural right of the poor as a popular delusion. If the rich should be taught to deny this natural right, a habit of mind full of misconception and unnatural would be formed in them ; and if the poor were to know that this last natural right in themselves and their children was denied, a dangerous resentment would inevitably arise.”

He did not desire to see the private employer absorbed by the State, but he boldly declared that “the public authorities ought to find work for those who want work or relief for those who cannot.” He was equally emphatic in his support of trade unions. “What a man can do for himself, the state should not do for him,” he wrote. “And the converse is good. Therefore self-help is collective. Therefore Union.”

But when Labour got out of hand, the Cardinal was outspoken in condemnation. The Trafalgar Square riot in November 1887, when John Burns and Cunningham Graham chained themselves to the railings of what was Morley’s Hotel, seemed to him senseless folly, calculated to check “the spread of sympathy and the restitution

of justice." The appeal to force was "criminal and immoral, venial in men maddened by suffering, but inexcusable in others."

In 1889 — he was then eighty-one — the opportunity came to Manning to put his principles into practice and forcibly to demonstrate the living sympathy, if not of the Catholic Church as a whole, of the most famous living Prince of the Church with the oppressed and the comparatively helpless.

Until the late 'eighties, British trade unionism had been almost entirely confined to the skilled workers, but in the Socialist enthusiasm of those years a successful attempt was made to organise the unskilled, particularly the dockers and the gas workers. Employment at the docks was casual and the wages were low, and in August 1889 the dockers struck for an additional penny an hour. Their pay was fivepence. They demanded a "tanner." The men's leaders were John Burns, destined twenty-seven years afterwards to be a Cabinet Minister, Tom Mann, still an active Communist agitator in constant trouble with authority, Ben Tillett, who retired from Parliament at the last election, and Henry Champion, a middle-class man, who afterwards, I believe, emigrated to Australia. Public opinion was definitely on the side of the strikers. Mann

and Tillett had before been in touch with the Cardinal, and they realised how immensely valuable his support would be. He was approached on August 30th, and, to quote Shane Leslie's fine sentence, "a dying man went down to rescue a dead city." He went to Dock House and harangued the directors on the evil of their ways, and a committee of reconciliation was formed of which the Lord Mayor and Temple, Bishop of London, were members, but which was completely dominated by Manning. "He chided," said Tillett, "the pomp of the Lord Mayor, the harshness of Temple, the pushfulness of Burns."

The employers had agreed to the "tanner an hour," but there was bitter disagreement as to when the new wage agreement was to begin. The strike took place in September, and the workers demanded "the tanner" from October 1st, while the employers refused to begin the increase until January 1st. So obstinate were both sides that the Lord Mayor and the Bishop of London gave up the whole thing in despair. But Manning was not to be beaten. He suggested November 4th as a compromise. He went himself to Poplar and argued with the strikers for over two hours, and at last he had his way, and the Cardinal's "peace" was signed on September

12th. Manning made no secret of his opinion of the dock directors. "If they had met their men face to face until they had come to an agreement, the strike would have ended in ten days," he said. And he referred scornfully to their "blind policy."

To show their gratitude the dockers collected £160, mainly in pennies, with which the Cardinal endowed a bed in the London Hospital. In an address accompanying the gift they said :

"When we remember how your Eminence, unasked and unsolicited, under the weight of fourscore and two years, came forward to mediate between master and man ; when we remember your prudent and wise counsels not to let any heat of passion or unreasonable view of the position beguile us or lead us away from the fair point of duty to our employers and ourselves ; and when, in fine, we recall to mind your venerable figure in our midst for over four hours in the Wade Street School, listening to our complaints and giving us advice in our doubts and difficulties, we seem to see a father in the midst of a loving and well-loved family rather than the ordinary mediator or benefactor in the thick of a trade dispute."

The Dock Strike gave Manning a position of influence with the people which no ecclesiastic

had had since the days of William Laud and no other English ecclesiastic has had since. Comparisons were inevitably made between his persistence and Temple's want of patience, Archbishop Benson sadly commenting that all the dockers could not be Roman Catholics.

From the Dock Strike until his death the Cardinal was the unofficial arbitrator in Labour disputes, and this intimate contact with industrial problems caused him in his extreme old age to give further and continued thought to the principles of a Christian sociology. He wrote in 1889:

“ Labour and skill are Capital as much as gold and silver. Labour and skill can produce without gold and silver. Gold and silver are dependent on Labour and skill, but Labour and skill are independent *in limine*. The union of the two Capitals demands participation in the product. Wages are minimised money representation of shares in product – that is, in profits. Silvertown gives 15 per cent to its share-holders and denies halfpence and farthings to its workers. That is more or less the state of the labour market at large. No strike is worth making except for a twofold share in the profits of a twofold Capital. But individualism, selfishness, freedom of contract, and competition, have obliterated the first principles of the Metayer System.”

In a letter to M. Decurtius, written in the summer of 1890, he said :

“ So long as the hours of labour have no other limit than the gain of the employer, no workman can live a life worthy of a human being. The humblest workman, no less than the man who is rich and literate, has need of certain hours wherein to cultivate his mind and soul ; and if such hours are not permitted him he is lowered to the state of a machine, or to that of a beast of burden. What manner of nation will be formed by men living in such conditions ? What must be the domestic, social, or political life of such men ? ”

And to another French correspondent in the same year he wrote :

“ I do not believe that the powerful relations of employers and employed will ever be safely and solidly secured until the just and due proportion between profits and wages shall have been fixed, recognised, laid down, and publicly known to govern all free contracts between capital and labour. And further, inasmuch as values in commerce must often vary, all such free contracts ought to be subject to periodical revision every three or five years, as may be mutually agreed in the contract.”

Manning's prestige in his own country had become so great that his interest in social problems

had its consequences through the entire Roman Communion. He was in constant and intimate touch with Cardinal Gibbons, and it was largely owing to the English and the American dignitaries that the Pope himself gave the long and careful attention to the condition of the working classes which resulted in the publication of the famous encyclical *Rerum Novarum* in the summer of 1891. Abbot Butler says in his life of Ullathorne :

“ Earlier perhaps than most, he [Manning] realised the inequalities and injustices of the actual modern social system, built up on industrialism, commercialism, machinery, unbridled competition, and the old-fashioned academic political economy ; and he was one of the first to raise his voice in protest against the un-Christian character of it all. His protest told not only in England but in Rome, and as one of the greatest achievements of his life must it be reckoned that it was he who, along with Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, encouraged Leo XIII to issue the great Encyclical of his Pontificate, the *Rerum Novarum*, on the Conditions of Labour, the formulation of Catholic teaching on the economic troubles that are vexing the world to-day.”

The publication of the Papal encyclical

produced a profound impression. Mr. Shane Leslie wrote thirty years later : "Catholic Democracy had come at last." But it has sorrowfully to be admitted that neither the words of the Pope nor the work of the Cardinal have had any great permanent effect either within the Roman Church or on the outside world. Capital still strives with Labour, and where the old social order has been destroyed a new order is being created that is definitely anti-Christian. Leo XIII and Manning dreaded Socialism. "Socialism is to society what Rationalism is to reason," the Cardinal once said ; but they could hardly have foreseen the coming of Bolshevism, which has compelled Rome to denounce Socialism as the creation of the devil.

Manning was, of course, delighted with the encyclical. It was the crown and justification of his life. He examined the pronouncement in a long article in the *Dublin Review* that appeared in July 1891, which he began with :

" Since the divine words of compassion on the multitude were spoken in the wilderness, no voice has been heard throughout the world pleading for the people with such profound and loving sympathy for those that toil and suffer as the voice of Leo XIII."

In his article he crosses the Holy Father's t's

and dots his i's, advocating among other things the legal determination of a living wage :

“ We must have here the measure of the minimum wage. It must be sufficient to maintain a man and his home. This does not mean a variable measure, or a sliding scale according to the number of children, but a fixed average sum. ‘ If through necessity or fear of worse evil the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice.’ The foundation of this judgment is in the law of nature. It is clear that the normal state of man in the natural order is that every man should have and should dwell in his own home, surrounded by the duties and charities of life. If the civil population of the country were debarred from marriage, like the standing army, the face of the country would be visited with all the evils of a garrison town.

“ Homeless men are reckless. There would be but little patriotism in a country where no man cares to stand *pro aris et focis*. The hearth-money of our forefathers was the sure pledge of their loyalty. The policy of the law – that is, its aim and spirit – is that homeless men be few, and that the homes of the people be the broad and solid foundation on which the commonwealth, in all

its social and political life, shall repose. We may therefore take the maintenance of a home as a minimum of a just wage."

Manning, indeed, was as insistent as the Socialists that, even when backed by a trade union, the worker is hopelessly handicapped against the capitalist, and that he needs, and is in constant need of, the protection of the law :

" It is evident that between a capitalist and a working man there can be no true freedom of contract. The capitalist is invulnerable in his wealth. The working man without bread has no choice but either to agree, or to hunger in his hungry home."

During the 'eighties, Manning, both from his sympathies and from his official position, was constantly concerned with the land agitation in Ireland and with the demand for Home Rule, and he was outspokenly on the side of the under dog. The attitude of the Irish landlords, he declared, meant : " Hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labour in vain, the breaking up of homes, the miseries, sicknesses, deaths of parents, children, wives." He none the less sternly denounced the outrages incidental to the land agitation.

In the summer of 1885, the Archbishopric of Dublin became vacant, and the Gladstonian

Government, which was divided and hastening to its fall, made strong representations at Rome against the selection of Dr. Walsh, who was a well-known partisan of Home Rule. Manning warned Rome of the disastrous effect both in Ireland and the United States of rejecting the man who was unanimously desired by Catholic Ireland, and after long hesitation Walsh was chosen. This was another victory for the English Cardinal. The choice was not made until the fall of the Liberal Government. In its last months Manning was in constant negotiation with Chamberlain and Dilke, two of the Liberal Ministers on the one side, and Parnell on the other, and it is one of the ironies of history that Captain O'Shea was his intermediary.

Lord Carnarvon was the Lord Lieutenant in the Salisbury administration formed in July 1885, and again Manning was busy with negotiations which nearly resulted in an alliance between Parnell and the Tory Party that would have entirely changed the trend of Anglo-Irish politics.

Gladstone was back in office again in 1886, and the first Home Rule Bill was proposed and rejected, Manning being very critical of certain of its provisions. His sympathy with Irish aspirations had revived the trouble with an important section of English Catholic opinion against which he had

to contend in his early days. In a letter to Gladstone, in which he protested that he had never been a party politician, he admitted : " Among my upper ten thousand friends I stand alone. They think me past praying for because I would not denounce Parnell and I would defend Archbishop Walsh."

Manning's position was peculiar to himself. He was a Home Ruler, but he did not believe that a Parliament in Dublin was compatible with the integrity and union of the two countries. " I repeat that the widest form of self-government with the power of creating laws for this purpose must be granted ; but a Parliament, no." I am bound to say that I fail to understand the difference as it appeared to Manning's subtle mind. His ideal was apparently a large measure of local self-government, which he also advocated for Scotland and for Wales.

The Second Home Rule Bill was thrown out by the House of Commons in the summer of 1886, largely through the opposition of Joseph Chamberlain, and a subsequent General Election gave a majority to the Conservatives acting in alliance with the newly formed Liberal Unionists. " I am watching with the greatest interest the break up of the Liberal Party," wrote Manning in December. In these years Leo XIII was himself

directly and keenly interested in the Irish question, and he sent an Italian Cardinal to Ireland to make direct reports to him. The result was the publication, in 1888, of a decree in which the Pope formally condemned the Plan of Campaign, which was the policy of the National League, and boycotting, which was its favourite method. The decree infuriated the Irish M.P.s, the great majority of whom were themselves Catholics. Manning himself considered the Plan of Campaign “an abnormal but moral equity.” He set out his views at length :

“ The English Government maintains itself in Ireland by the help of 14,000 armed Constabulary, a force of highly disciplined troops, and at least 28,000 of our regular army – that is, 42,000 armed men.

“ The Government of Ireland is in the hands of officials, English, Scots, and Irish, almost exclusively Protestant. Even the magistrates are removable by Dublin Castle.

“ The effect of this is perpetual irritation, suspicion, and resentment. The present Government would fall to-morrow if it were not upheld by this Protestant party. Law, order, and authority may be maintained, but at the cost of violating the moral justice by which alone nations are governed.

"Since this Government came in, Ireland has had a Crimes Act, but not a remedy for one of its just complaints.

"I told Goschen at the Athenæum : 'If you had held out a ray of hope you might have governed Ireland.' But no : this Government relies on force."

In 1890 came the O'Shea divorce case, which split the Home Rule Party, brought Parnell's political supremacy to an end, and was responsible for his comparatively early death. There was wide resentment in Ireland at English – and, as was not unfairly alleged, hypocritical – interference with Irish affairs which found its expression in Gladstone's demand that Parnell should resign. Manning, an Englishman and a Puritan, wrote : "I feel that two virtues of the Irish heart, gratitude and chivalry for a man that is down, have carried the people away from their graces."

The Irish Bishops were all against Parnell. His Parliamentary lieutenants, who for years had been irritated by his scornful superiority, were in revolt. But Parnell fought on, holding the rump of his party, including the Redmonds, faithful to him until his death in October 1891.

Mr. Shane Leslie says of Manning's politics that "his Radicalism was Biblical, his Imperialism

Christian, his Socialism Franciscan, his Home Rule federal, and he was even a fair free trader." He was, as he insisted, a politician without a party, and it has been suggested that he was only interested in politics at all in order to further the position of his Church. I think that this is not true. For two very different reasons, Manning had a direct interest in national politics. He was vividly concerned with social and industrial conditions as they affected the lives of the poor, whether they were Catholics or not, while he quite evidently immensely enjoyed pulling strings and being a sort of power behind the throne. This is shown in his letters to Disraeli, to Gladstone, and to Chamberlain.

At the same time it may be admitted that his real objection to the withdrawal of the Irish members from Westminster, as part of the Home Rule Scheme, was due to the fact that, with the Irish gone, the Roman Church would have the scantiest representation in the English Parliament. He wanted Roman Catholics at Westminster, and he encouraged Catholic Conservatives to seek election and to play a leading part in politics. The result was sometimes disconcerting. A Roman Catholic became Vice-Chancellor of the Primrose League, and there was a minor flutter when the League was denounced as a secret

society by the Catholic Bishop of Nottingham, and when an Irish Bishop, a fervent Home Ruler, refused absolution to a member of the League. But Vaughan, himself a good Tory, hurried to Rome, and Tory Romans were henceforth allowed to wear primroses in their buttonholes on the anniversary of the death of Benjamin Disraeli.

It is particularly interesting to note, in these days when the housing problem is again much in the public mind, that Manning was a member of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, appointed in 1884, the Prince of Wales being one of his fellow-members. The Cardinal was definitely against the slum landlord. He said : "I am Radical enough to deny the right of property to the extortionate renting of house jobbers. One ought to annul *ipso facto* an extortionate rent and some authority might be created to pronounce what is extortionate." The Committee's report was much milder than Manning desired, but, mild as it was, its suggestions were largely ignored, though it may be believed that the Commission and its findings were responsible for the Housing Act of 1890.

Education had been Manning's first pre-occupation when he seceded to Rome. It remained one of his greatest interests until his death. He urged the Conservative leaders to amend the

Education Act of 1870 on the ground that it inflicted injustice and hardship on denominational schools. And he served on an Education Commission appointed to consider a new policy, among the other members being Dr. Temple, Bishop of London, Dr. Rigg, a Wesleyan, and Dr. Dale, the famous Birmingham Congregationalist whom Manning detested. With the backing of the Anglicans, Manning dominated the Commission, which secured the principle of rate aid for voluntary schools, which was bitterly fought by the Nonconformists in the early years of this century, but which remains to this day.

Catholic democracy seemed to have been born with the publication of the encyclical of 1891. Writing forty-four years afterwards, it is tragic to note how the enthusiasm for social reform that marked the later years of Cardinal Manning's life, and gave the Roman Church in England for a few years immense influence and prestige, practically came to an end in his Church at his death. In this century the priests and prelates who have inherited his anger at social injustice and his zeal for social reform have, for the most part, belonged to the Church from which the Cardinal seceded.

CHAPTER IV

THE JESUITS AND NEWMAN

Hostility to Jesuits – *The Episcopal Office* – misunderstandings with Newman – Newman made a Cardinal.

MANNING inherited a suspicion of the Jesuits from Wiseman, who believed that they had opposed the institution of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. Manning himself was received into the Church by a Jesuit priest, and professed unbounded admiration for the Society's devotion. But he was the champion of the世俗s, and he declared that “the regulars depress the priesthood to elevate the state of vows, and I am obliged to say that in this the Jesuits are the chief offenders.”

Again with Wiseman, he was convinced that England could only be converted by secular priests, and as a Bishop, with a profound idea of the authority and dignity of his office, he resented the Jesuit semi-repudiation of local episcopal authority and their claim to work directly under the authority of the Pope, and actually to be responsible to him alone. Jesuit influence had been firmly established for generations with the educated Catholic laity, and particularly with the old Catholic families, and they had succeeded in

the establishment of schools, in which Manning had failed. His attitude to the Society was clearly defined in a series of memoranda. The Society, he said, is “St. Ignatius in perpetuity, Spanish, aristocratic, absolute, and military.” At the beginning they had fought disobedience with obedience and had been of priceless service to the Church. But soon they had developed “both assumption and presumption.”

“They are Papal by their vow, but in their spirit, they are less Papal than anti-Episcopal. Their claim of special dependence on the Pope breeds everywhere a spirit of independence of local authority. This is a grave danger to them, and few of them escape it. The anti-episcopal spirit shows itself in their treatment of their own men when they become Bishops. They are like the Low Church Evangelicals in the Anglican Church, who look on their Bishops as ‘enemies of vital Godliness.’ This is history. There is only a plank between them and Presbyterianism. Until lately their theologians have taught that the Episcopate is only the Pope’s Vicariate. When a Jesuit is made a Bishop, they put him out and butt him to death. This unhappy spirit has never been cast out. Even St. Charles had to strive with it. If a Bishop will give in to them, they will recommend him, on the next vacancy, to the next

Archbishopric. If he holds his own, then let him look out. Shakespeare brings in 'rumour pointed full of tongues.' There is no greater gossip than a *Gesu*."

The Cardinal went on to accuse the Society of "mixing and meddling in the politics in every court in Europe," and he roundly denounced the assertion of one of the Provincials that whatever is good for the Society is good for the diocese. The actual quarrel between the Cardinal and the Society began in 1875, when the Jesuits opened a school in Manchester without obtaining permission from Herbert Vaughan, the Bishop of the diocese, and the Archbishop stated his case with considerable exaggeration.

Manning correctly ascribed the secession of England from the Roman Catholic Church, first to the loss of the parish priests, and secondly to the attempt, in the reign of Queen Mary, to recover such ground as had been lost by force, and by force that was foreign. When, in the English mind, Rome became associated and almost synonymous with Spain, workaday England revolted against Rome, and not till then. That is to say, the Reformation in England was far more political than religious. But it is difficult to follow the Cardinal in his charge that the Jesuits were in any way responsible for an

undoubted historical fact. He said, for example, that “there can be no doubt that the Jesuits from R. Parsons downwards have hindered the restoration of the Church in England.” Writing outside the Roman allegiance, there seems to me the smallest possible evidence for this charge. Possibly certain Jesuit priests were concerned in the plottings against the life of Queen Elizabeth, but equally certainly there is no justification for the gross misrepresentation of the Jesuits by Charles Kingsley, which has been accepted and repeated ever since by half-instructed Protestant apologists.

The fact is that Manning was jealous of the Jesuits, and his jealousy was shared by his fellow-bishops, and particularly by Herbert Vaughan. He was jealous of their influence, jealous of their ability, and jealous of their coherence. He said – and again, I think, quite unfairly – that they put the Society before the Church. The truth seems to be that the Jesuits believed that they could best serve the Church by retaining a large measure of independence from local authority, while Manning was as firmly convinced that, if England was to be won back to the Faith, which was the dream of his life, there must be unqualified obedience within each diocese to the Bishop of that diocese, the suffragan of the Holy Father.

He was essentially a man of order. Disobedience or even the questioning of authority were sins in his eyes. "The essence of the episcopate is government," he wrote, and government must be obeyed. This resolve to bring the religious orders to heel caused Manning to write in 1883 a very curious book, which he called *The Episcopal Office*. It was read by Ullathorne, who strongly urged that it should not be published, but it was privately printed in 1885, and, thanks to the kindness of Mr. Shane Leslie, I am able to quote from this little known and very curious volume. In intention, as I have said, it is a cry for obedience in a lawless world :

"The spirit of the day is independence, and it acknowledges no law above itself. Religion with many is piety and emotion, without submission to authority, or the recognition of a law to which all are subject. And this impatience of authority and control arises not only from insubordination of the will, but also from the independence of the intellect, which is ever reducing to a minimum the reach of authority and the obligations of obedience. Some Catholics seem to revel in reducing the obedience they owe to the Vicar of our Lord, to the Episcopate, to the priesthood, and to the *credenda* and *agenda* of the Catholic life, within the smallest and narrowest proportions.

To them the priesthood is an office for preaching and dispensing the Sacraments, and the Episcopate an office for administering one Sacrament more than the priesthood. The thought of government is either excluded or tacitly ignored, and this falls in readily with the all but universal tendency to shake off control in every class and state of life."

While it is the business of the Bishop to rule, the Religious cannot claim any right to independent judgment on account of the particular sanctity of their lives :

" In the language of the schools, there are two states of perfection – the state of the Episcopate and the state of religious orders. The first was a direct divine institution by our Lord in person ; the second was instituted by the Church."

The state of the Episcopate is more exalted than the state of the religious orders. " The order of Bishops is that which makes others perfect while the order of monks is the order of those who are made perfect." And Manning went on :

" It is plain that greater perfection is required to the end of imparting perfection to others, than to the end of one being perfect in himself ; inasmuch as it is greater to be able to make another perfect than to be perfect ; and every cause is

forwardness, how shall he escape S. Paul's sentence, 'All men seek the things that are their own ; not the things that are Jesus Christ's ? ' "

The Bishop, he said, as St. Thomas teaches, is bound to chastity, poverty, and obedience. He owes obedience first to the Vicar of Christ and then " to every soul committed to him." This is a very odd passage, which I do not profess to understand. As for charity, the Bishop is bound " to lay down his life by martyrdom, by pestilence, by labour as it may be for his sheep." As to vows, " they are among the means and helps whereby perfection may by certain persons and in certain states be more easily attained." And nothing more. Indeed, Manning goes so far as to suggest that God is served more effectively in the world than in the cloister :

" The good of the Universal Church is the highest end of the highest office, and to that office our Divine Master has attached all the graces and means and helps of His holy Spirit, so that they who serve Him in the world shall be surely sanctified. For them He said, ' I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world ; but that Thou shouldest keep them from evil. They are not of the world, as I also am not of the world. Sanctify them in truth. Thy word is truth. As Thou has sent Me into the world, I also have sent

them into the world.' In this sense the priesthood of Jesus Christ is secular, because He sent it forth into the world; and it is His will that we should dwell and labour and war and suffer in the world to be the 'light of the world' and 'the salt of the earth.' "

Manning had the most exalted conception of the Bishop's office. Although the Pope to him was a great deal more than *primus inter pares*, he claimed for every individual Bishop a spiritual authority which, on the face of it, appears almost equal to the Pope's. Thus he wrote :

" It will, I believe, be defined that in virtue of consecration every Bishop receives the apostolic power of the keys, and that in this Divine grant resides the power of governing the Church. The potential jurisdiction of governing is as full in every Bishop by consecration, as the potential jurisdiction of absolving is in every priest by ordination. The Bishop may never hold a diocese, and may never receive actual jurisdiction ; the priest may never receive faculties, and may never absolve a soul. But the Divine power is there, and to deny it will, I believe, be noted as rash and erroneous at least."

Two years before the printing of *The Episcopal Office*, the dispute with the Jesuits had been decided in the Cardinal's favour. It had been

referred to Rome in the last days of the Pontificate of Pius IX, and was further considered in the early years of the Pontificate of Leo XIII. The Cardinals, who were themselves Religious, were naturally inclined to support Jesuit claims, and the generals of the other religious orders were at first nominally on their side, though Franciscans, Capuchins, Passionists, and Redemptorists rallied to the Bishops, and eventually the Jesuits had the support only of the Benedictines. Leo XIII was apparently reluctant to make up his mind, but he agreed with Manning that it was a matter of the first importance that the education of the clergy should be in the hands of secular priests.

Manning was able to put up a good case. The Church in England had only comparatively small funds at its disposal, and it was vital that money should be spent with prudence and care. The Benedictines had run up a debt of £110,000. Uncontrolled extravagance of this sort was intolerable, and largely owing to the persistence of Vaughan, who spent years in Rome, the Jesuits were finally defeated in a Bull published in February 1881.

There was a personal element which embittered this protracted contest. Manning's secretary and his nephew had joined the Society, permanently to pass from his interest and affection.

The years of Manning's contests with the Jesuits were also the years of his last disagreement with Newman. The differences between the two men could hardly be exaggerated. As Shane Leslie says, they were born to disagree. As I have written elsewhere, Newman was essentially a Liberal ; Manning was an ultramontane. Newman was an artist ; Manning was a man of affairs. Newman was a recluse, concerned only with matters of the spirit ; Manning was an administrator acutely interested in all contemporary affairs. Among other things — and this comparatively small issue illustrates the gulf that separated them — Manning was a fervent teetotaller, while Newman wrote : "As to what you tell me of Archbishop Manning, I have heard that some of our Irish bishops think that too many drink shops are licensed. As for me, I do not know whether we have too many or too few."

Arnold Lunn says in his *Roman Converts*, written, it should be remembered, before he himself joined the company :

"Manning was naturally credulous ; Newman was naturally sceptical and cultivated credulity as a sacred duty. No man understood more clearly than Newman the speciousness of doubt and the difficulties of faith. He was reduced in self-defence to invent a philosophy which would

justify, not only the Nicene Creed, but a firm faith in winking Virgins and liquefying blood. In the business of faith he showed an infinite capacity for taking pains.

“Manning’s credulity, on the other hand, was the natural and artless credulity of the child. He never needed to master the Grammar of Assent, for where Newman believed as the result of practice and taking thought, Manning swallowed the supernatural by sheer glad instinct.”

And Canon Lacey wrote of Manning :

“Newman’s conception of Assent, the reasoning of the heart which the mind knows not, was abhorrent to him. He wrote to Gladstone in 1861: ‘When I laid down all that I had, including your friendship, precious to me beyond wealth or prosperity, it was that I might cast the last weight I had into the scale of positive truth.’ Positive truth, hard and clear, was what he understood ; it was all one, whether it was positive truth as taught him by Miss Bevan’s tradition, or positive truth as propounded in a papal definition. Not for him were the *umbræ et imagines* among which Newman was content to walk until he should pass *in veritatem*. Perhaps there is the secret of their incompatibility. Newman could hardly tolerate Manning ; Manning could never understand Newman. Singularly

diverse, they were alike in this : greatly human, meant for the whole of mankind, they were sealed by circumstance to a part. But again their fates diverged. Newman discovered himself to the world ; Manning had to be discovered."

Manning gladly admitted that Newman was far above him in gifts and culture, and that they had only diverged on public duties. Lytton Strachey's suggestion that Manning was merely meanly jealous of Newman's fame, and took a petty pleasure in humiliating him, is an unfair exaggeration. But it was Manning who killed Newman's Oxford scheme, and, although Newman forgave easily, he was not a man to forget. Ward, who was closely associated with Manning, persistently attacked Newman's orthodoxy in the *Dublin Review*, and Manning admitted his responsibility for the publication of the attacks, and the fact that representatives of the Catholic aristocracy wrote to Newman, "Every blow that touches you inflicts a wound upon the Catholic Church in this country," stimulated Manning's resentment. He regarded Newman as the apostle of a modified Catholicism, "the old Anglican, patristic, literary, Oxford Don transplanted into the Church."

It is curious that, almost at the same time as this letter in which this charge occurred was written,

Manning wrote to Newman expressing personal admiration and regard.

While Pius IX lived, Manning had been able to suggest that Newman was opposed on more than one vital matter to the official policy of the Vatican. This suggestion was untenable after the Pope's death and the reign of Leo XIII had begun. Newman had been neglected and snubbed. With a Liberal Pope at the Vatican, it seemed to the Roman Catholic laity that Newman's eminence should now, at long last, have adequate official recognition. It was believed – and the correspondence published by Purcell to a large extent justifies the belief – that Manning was at first disinclined to support the appeal, but a letter written in 1875 shows that by then he was convinced that Newman had been treated most ungenerously. He wrote to Rome :

“ The veneration for his powers, his learning, and his life of singular piety and integrity is almost as deeply felt by the non-Catholic population of this country as by the members of the Catholic Church.

“ In the rise and revival of Catholic Faith in England there is no one whose name will stand out in history with so great a prominence.”

In 1879 Manning advised Newman of his probable election to the Sacred College. Cardinals

who are not Bishops are expected to live in Rome, and Newman, an old and broken man, fearful of changing his home and his habits, wrote a carefully worded letter intended to ask for the particular favour of receiving the Cardinal's hat while still living in Birmingham. Manning misread the letter – his enemies say maliciously – and it was reported in the Press that the purple had been declined. Thanks largely to Ullathorne, who was always a peacemaker, matters were put right, and the Pope gladly gave Newman the special favour which he had begged as “a testimony to Dr. Newman's virtues and learning and an act pleasing to the Catholics of England.”

Manning would most certainly have been glad if the honour had not been granted. And probably the incident has been fairly summarised by Arnold Lunn :

“ We need not blame Manning because he did not wish to see Newmanism honoured. Had he refused point-blank to recommend Newman for this honour he would have been within his rights. Probably he fully intended to send off his letter by the first post, and then, like many elderly people, he gradually postponed a disagreeable duty. Then came Newman's official refusal. The temptation to adopt a ‘matter-of-fact’ attitude was too strong. It is easy to see how it all happened.

“ And yet there is evidence enough to show that it was Newmanism rather than Newman that Manning disliked. There is evidence in plenty that Manning retained throughout life a real reverence for the great Oxford leader of his youth, qualified by a hearty dislike for many of that leader’s views. In all their conflicts as Roman Catholics, Manning appears to have done his best to render Newman harmless, but never to have injured Newman more than was necessary. On more than one occasion he defended him at Rome. Newman’s reply to Gladstone, for instance, was disliked at Rome, and there was some talk of an official censure. Manning wrote a warm-hearted defence of Newman, a letter which righted him at Rome, and without which Newman would certainly never have been made a Cardinal.”

The Abbot Butler reports an interesting conversation with Ullathorne on the subject :

“ At a certain point in the plantation His Grace [Ullathorne] poured out not one but ‘ seven vials of wrath ’ upon his Eminence’s conduct on this occasion. ‘ What do you think ? He lectured me as though I had been a boy for suggesting Newman’s promotion to the cardinalate, and urging it so strongly. Manning said to me : “ You do not know Newman as I do. He simply twists you round his little finger ; he

bamboozles you with his carefully selected words, and plays so subtly with his logic that your simplicity is taken in. *You are no match for him !* ” ” This last sentence His Grace repeated and said to me, ‘ What do you think of that ? ’ I quietly, but wickedly replied, ‘ I presume you have retaliated.’ He smiled and took a long pinch of snuff. For His Grace to be told that he was no match for anyone, even though the ‘ anyone ’ be a Newman, was enough to rouse the British lion : *sed pungit cauda* – the sting was in the tail – that ‘ no match ’ His Grace could not forgive. The Archbishop then detailed to me the whole of the correspondence, etc., which ended in Newman’s elevation, but which H. E. Cardinal Manning strongly opposed – at least, such was the conclusion to be gathered from this memorable talk. The Archbishop plainly told the Cardinal that it was he himself (Manning) who was no match for Newman. He distrusted Newman, whilst the Archbishop told him that there was no one honester on earth ; that his only aim in this world was to advance the cause of religion ; that his deep humility forced him to come to the surface to show his sincerity ; that he was an avowed hater of all duplicity or intrigue ; and much more to the purpose.

“ The Archbishop considered that Manning’s

act in this matter showed a great weakness in his character, and intimated that it was invariably the failing of men who travelled on such lines. By which he gave me to suppose that he thought Manning a man who aimed at ‘Eminence’ because he was a lover of power and of influencing others.”

The two English Cardinals met very seldom, but Newman was punctilious in his proper submission to Manning’s episcopal authority, and on several occasions Manning went out of his way to pay deference to the man whom Shane Leslie well describes as “his gracious rival.” When Newman died in 1890, Manning preached the sermon at his Requiem, and rarely, it was said, has one great man spoken of another great man with such moving and sincere eloquence. Nothing could be better than Shane Leslie’s comparison between their essentials. Newman became world-famous from writing his *Apologia* : Manning was convinced that Churchmen should never apologise.

CHAPTER V

THE CLOSING YEARS

Failing grip—sympathy with Salvation Army—illness and death—diary of his retreat at Highgate in 1865.

MANNING lived for years, and finally died, in a gloomy half-furnished house in the Vauxhall Bridge Road. Death came to him slowly. His strength gradually failed. He was unable to preach. He lost touch with the authorities at Rome and with the secular powers at home. He outlived much of his influence, and, in some respects, his last years were years of defeat. To quote one instance. In nothing had he striven harder than to prevent Catholics being sent to Oxford, and three years before his death the Duke of Norfolk sent his nephew to the University ! Manning wrote :

“ The act of the Duke of Norfolk is a shock to me. He knows what the Holy See has said and what the Bishops for twenty-four years have done. And now we have Denbigh and the Duke openly going against our whole and known action by mere wilfulness. And this when Oxford has become a moral wreck and has admitted women.

I thank God that neither you nor I have ever swerved. We have nothing to answer for."

But nothing could happen to him that he had not anticipated. Years before, he wrote : " To labour and suffer for souls who will not be redeemed. To go down into fire and into the water to save souls and to be wounded for them. All this I look for. And I look to be wounded, as Jesus was, by my own brethren."

As the years closed in, the mind of the old man went back to the past, and there was a new note of pathetic affection in his references to his old home and to his surviving relatives, with a wider appreciation of the qualities of those outside his fold. He annoyed his friends by his constant and sympathetic attitude to the Salvation Army, and he vehemently opposed the disestablishment of the English Church. His correspondents included many Anglican ecclesiastics, who consulted him on questions of discipline, and he had a postal argument with Dean Farrar concerning the doctrine of eternal punishment. He was keenly interested in the Jews during the pogroms in Russia, and the Jewish community in England presented him with an address of thanks on the occasion of his jubilee in 1890. He particularly admired the Jews for the care they took of their poor, and their concern for working girls in the

East End. And he paid them this fine tribute :

“ A race with a sacred history of nearly four thousand years ; at present without a parallel, dispersed in all lands, with an imperishable personal identity, isolated and changeless, greatly afflicted, without home or fatherland ; visibly reserved for a future of signal mercy. Into this I will not enter further than to say that any man who does not believe in their future must be a careless reader, not only of the old Jewish Scriptures, but even of our own. It is not our duty to add to their afflictions, nor to look on unmoved, and to keep the garments, while others stone them. If we know the mind of our Master Who prayed for them in His last hour, we owe to them both the justice of the old law and the charity of the new.”

Manning was attacked by bronchitis in the early days of January 1892. On the Wednesday before his death, clad in his episcopal robes and surrounded by his suffragans, he made his formal profession of faith, receiving the last Sacraments and the Papal blessing. Vaughan and Gasquet watched by his bedside, and at eight o’clock in the morning, while Vaughan was saying Mass, Manning died.

He lay in state at the London Oratory, and the Mass of Requiem was sung by Bishop Clifford.

His funeral was a great popular demonstration. From Kensington to Kensal Green the streets were lined by the poor, weeping for the great Cardinal who was for them the Good Samaritan.

Shane Leslie has made a tremendous claim for Manning. He has called him “the great, human, terrible, lonely, loving and lovesome Cardinal who ruled in England for Christ.” Arnold Lunn is more critical: “The unseen was the great reality of his life; but he was also ambitious; he loved power and honour, and he was perhaps not over nice in his controversial tactics.” I find small justification for this praising with faint damns. If Manning sought power, it was as a means to an end. If he had sought honour, would he have refused the Papal throne? The real Manning is, I suggest, to be found in the diary of the ten days’ retreat he kept at Highgate in the summer of 1865, from which I have already quoted. The following are typical extracts :

“ In all these years I have worked as I could and I have desired to see work done. But I cannot say that I have deliberately acted on my ambitious intention. I was no sooner in the Church than my name came in the newspapers for Southwark, then as Coadjutor to the Cardinal, then for Nottingham, then for Clifton, then I was elected for Northampton. God knows, before

Whom I write, that no word or deed of mine provoked this. I have been surrounded by this talk through no known act of mine for these fourteen years. I was forced all the more into it by those who opposed us. I have touched the subject only in one point and that was to render impossible what the Holy Father has now done.

“ O my God, if in this there has been ambition make me to see it as Thou seest it, lest I go down to the Pit deceiving myself. And let not this be the end of more than thirty years of natural activity. Let me not hear the Sentence ‘ Verily thou hast thy reward.’ Rather than lose Thee not only hereafter but now in this life, I would lay down all in the world and live and die out of sight and out of mind if only Thou remember me, and forget all my sins. Let me not climb up here unbidden or ‘ by another way,’ nor let me offer myself uncalled, or fill this place by my own will or by the will of man.

“ But though I know that my natural activity bears the look of fervour, my spiritual life does not correspond. I am conscious how much more readily I turn to work than to prayer, how much more willingly I turn from prayer than from work. Yet I remember a Confessor once consoled me by saying only too kindly ‘ all your life is prayer.’ I trust I may say all my life is work, and work, if

it be God's work, is indeed prayer. But I do not dare to think this of myself. . . .”

Equally revealing of a consistent state of mind are the diaries of the last years of his life.

“God knows how I have fallen short of my resolutions and of my life. So far as I know I have not turned back, not turned aside. God, not my will, has kept me out of the world, though working in it and among my priests. I hope I have lived among them and for them.”

“In a month's time, if I live, I shall enter my eighty-second year. Abide with me, dwell in me, pervade me, cast out of me all that is contrary to Thy holy Will.”

“I know that an intellectual religion may be only a *fides diabolica*. Life without love is a separation from God. And yet the soul must be conformed to God in all its powers, heart, will, interest and intellect. And it is by the sanctified intellect that the heart and will are conformed to the Will, Love, and Intelligence of God. For this cause He has revealed Himself, and His revelation conforms our intelligence to His. Therefore we are bound to seek a definite knowledge of His revelation; for there can be no knowledge of what is indefinite. Truth has its own outlines as every substance has its own form.”

“The Catholic Church alone teaches the

universality of truth and charity. Truth has an authority that demands obedience. It lays a jurisdiction on the reason, conscience and will because it is true. Falsehood has no jurisdiction."

" You hear people ask whether or not God can hinder sin and evil, and if He can, why He does not. God might have made us as machines, without knowledge and will, or He might have made us like sheep and oxen, with no power of knowing right from wrong. But in His love and goodness, He has made us in His own image and likeness. This is the happiness of a creature, to have a will, and to be like its Maker. All good comes from the will of God, and all evil from the abuse of our own free will. It is indeed a great responsibility to be made in the likeness of God."

Essentially an ecclesiastical statesman, Manning was nevertheless always a pastor of souls.

He may have been arrogant. He was certainly impatient of disagreement and criticism. With lesser men he had his prejudices. He brooked no rival within his kingdom, and jealousy unquestionably affected his relations with Newman. But the Cardinal commands admiration from two points of view.

He was magnificently courageous. Hardly had he been admitted into the Roman fold when he was tilting against the most influential of English

Roman Catholics. Installed as Archbishop, he at once began a contest with the Jesuits. From the beginning he followed a consistent ecclesiastical policy, maintaining the full authority of the episcopacy, and preferring everywhere the service of the secular priest rather than the regular.

Manning's second great quality was his love of the poor. There was nothing of namby-pamby sentimentality in his attitude. Poverty and oppression made him angry. They were wicked, an offence to God, and as such they should be an incitement to the persistent and valiant use of the sword of the Lord and of Gideon. "A child's needless tear is a blood-blot upon the earth," he said. Suffering, oppression, and injustice – he tilted successfully at them all. And the success was largely due to the fact that, however severe he might be with rebellious prelate and disobedient monk, there was no suggestion of condescension in his relation with trade union leaders and the denizens of mean streets. "I have a great belief in the existence of saints in secret," he once wrote, "and especially among the poor."

He lived his long life with a heavy burden of responsibility. He found the explanation of the woes of the world in the shortcomings of the Church. "It is the fault of the shepherds, when

the sheep have gone astray." His uncompromising Puritanism - he was not, by the way, as some people suppose, the first Catholic Puritan - was due entirely to this sense of responsibility. It was intolerable to him that priests should spend their money in buying wine, and that the faithful laity should waste their time in theatres, while humanity was running down a steep hill to the sea. He lived fiercely. He never spared himself, nor anyone else. He was a man - a complexity as all men are, hard and soft, stern and friendly, proud and humble. A man, a good man, and a great.

and an equally dull respectability was characteristic of religion.

The great ecclesiastic may affect, and often has fundamentally affected, the life of his generation and the development of social and political thought. But, in the world that dates its beginning from the industrial revolution, the great ecclesiastic has very rarely been a popular figure, has rarely stood in the centre of the world's stage, conspicuous in the limelight, the object of popular plaudits.

In the eighteen-eighties the Tractarian Movement in the Church of England had begun to permeate the parishes, much to the annoyance of Queen Victoria, but the prosecution of a few parish priests, under the Public Worship Regulation Act, had proved a hopeless failure, and in the last years of the century the transformation of the Church of England proceeded steadily and quietly, without attracting any large measure of public attention. The Church was ruled by the colourless Thompson of York and the cautious High Church Benson of Canterbury. Liddon was attracting huge congregations by his eloquent and extremely lengthy sermons at St. Paul's. But the Church certainly did not possess any great national figure whom the man in the street knew as he knew Gladstone and Chamberlain. Among

Nonconformists, Spurgeon was in the last years of his life – he died before he was sixty – perturbed by the theological Liberalism of his brethren, and hotly denouncing their disloyalty to traditional Calvinism ; and Nonconformity generally, under the leadership of John Clifford, was at the beginning of the loss of its spiritual fervour and influence and was rapidly becoming the Sunday branch of the Liberal Party.

Two contemporary figures, and two figures alone, in the world of religion had personality, picturesqueness, and a large measure of audacity : one was William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army, the other was Henry Edward Manning, Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Their names were familiar to tens of thousands who certainly did not know the names of either the Archbishop of York or His Grace of Canterbury. They had what is now known as a consistent news interest. They were flamboyant ; they were unusual. The General, with his hooked nose, the Cardinal, with his emaciated frame and thin ascetic face, were men in whom the nation was keenly interested even when it criticised and disagreed.

Manning succeeded in two great historic enterprises which have had a profound effect on the history of the years since his death. His intervention

in the Dock Strike in 1889 was the declaration of the living interest of the Christian Church in the material conditions of the lives of the humble and the poor. It was the practical application of the principles of the Gospel to social life, the assertion that Christianity is a corporate and not an individualist religion. It is true, of course, that social Christianity had been preached years before in the Church of England by Kingsley and by Maurice, and later, in the 'eighties, by Canon Scott Holland and his friends. Their influence was considerable within a narrow circle. But the backing of the dockers by the Cardinal was dramatic. It was a victory for Christianity, for it was generally believed, and it was probably true, that, but for him, the strike would have been a failure, the revolution in the trade union movement caused by the organisation of unskilled labour would never have occurred, and the political Labour Party, which owes its creation to that revolution, might well have been postponed for a generation. The Dock Strike is a key event in the history of the British Labour Movement. It was a Prince of the Church who secured its success.

The social enthusiasm that inspired the Cardinal, the care for "these little ones," the unfortunate and the helpless, has vastly affected the

attitude of the Church generally towards social problems. It has had, as a matter of fact, a far more obvious effect outside than inside the Cardinal's own Communion, and particularly, in these days, in the Church of England, where what may be called the Manning spirit inspired the two Archbishops to pledge the faithful to the crusade against the slums and inspired Dr. Temple to demand the restoration of the cuts in unemployment benefit. Otherworldliness, in so far as that term implies the injunction painfully and patiently to accept the worst possible conditions in this life with the assurance of perfect happiness in the life to come, is to-day regarded as entirely alien to the Christian religion. And here it is worth noting that, while Booth was mainly concerned with individual conversions, proclaiming that what the world most needed was a change of heart and not a change of material conditions, he was by no means indifferent to the existence of social hardship and inequality, nor did he fail to recognise the effect of evil circumstances on character. While, indeed, Manning was backing the dockers, Booth was busy collecting material for his book, *In Darkest England and the Way Out*, which was published in 1890. Manning was keenly appreciative of the Salvation Army's devotion and its care for the poor. He

wrote in 1890 : "The work of the Salvation Army with all its faults is too real to be any longer disregarded and ascribed to the devil. We are bound not to be outdone in self-sacrifice and in love of souls."

Manning's interest in social problems, and the boldness of his criticism of existing social conditions, laid him open to frequent attacks from defenders of the *status quo*, and he was frequently and sharply reproved in the columns of *The Times*. But his interventions were part of his religion. "I loved Christ," he once said, to Henry George, "and so learned to love the people for whom He died." He had, indeed, a clear vision that an old order was changing and a new order coming into being, though, of course, he could not have foreseen that the old order was to be abruptly and catastrophically destroyed by a great war, and he was eager above all other things that the Church should inspire and guide in a transformation that was inevitable. He wrote, in January 1891, to the Count de Mun :

"The coming age will belong neither to the capitalists nor to the commercial classes, but to the people. The people are yielding to the guidance of reason, even to the guidance of religion. If we can gain their confidence we can counsel them ; if we show them a blind

opposition they will have power to destroy all that is good. But I hope much from the action of the Church all Governments are despoiling and rejecting. Her true home is with the People ; they will hear her voice."

Here indeed, was the voice of the revolutionist.

Forty years ago the Church of England was commonly described, and not unfairly, as the Sunday edition of the Tory Party, and the attitude of a well-to-do pious Protestant to his less fortunate fellow-countrymen was still much the same as that of Wilberforce, of whom Mr. and Mrs. Hammond have written in *The Town Labourer* : "What tortured him was the thought that a man who read Paine and talked like a Jacobin, who grudged the rich their wealth, and the aristocracy their power, might still be at large, spreading the irreligious spirit of discontent."

Newman lived remote from the sorrows of the slums and the trials of the suburbs. Pusey showed his sympathy with human suffering by spending months in Bethnal Green, when he was a man of sixty-nine, during an outbreak of cholera, tending the sick in their plague-stricken hovels, and before Manning played his dramatic part in the Dock Strike of 1889, the beneficent history of Anglo-Catholicism had begun in the

backwashes of the great cities. But the slum priest lived and died in self-effacing obscurity. It was his high office that gave Manning's action its great significance, and without question it was he, and he alone, who first acclaimed, in a voice that the outside world was compelled to hear, that because a man holds the Catholic faith in his heart, he must care immensely and entirely for the victims of misfortune and oppression. I do not think it is the smallest exaggeration to say that the varied, often rather confused and generally ill-directed, movements that may be lumped together under the name of Christian Socialism, are the consequence of Manning's intervention in mundane affairs.

The average Victorian Englishman had hardly ever heard the name of Wiseman, and knew little or nothing about Newman. Manning popularised the Roman Catholic Church. That was his second and complementary achievement. He was an Englishman ; he had played in the Harrow Eleven ; he had been an Anglican Archdeacon ; and when he became the head of the Roman Catholic community in this country, he gave it a new importance and significance. When, in the second phase of the history of the Tractarian Movement, the claim of the English Church to be the Catholic Church in England became more

insistent, Liddon coined the phrase the “ Italian Mission ” to suggest the foreign origin and foreign allegiance of the Roman Church. But it became a little preposterous to describe a Church as an “ Italian Mission ” when its Cardinal Archbishop emphasised his British citizenship by a keen and independent interest in public affairs, and had added immensely to the prestige of his Church by becoming the recognised champion of the poor.

Manning gained for the Church of Rome a widespread and almost national respect, which it certainly did not have before. Despite the existence in England of a considerable number of Roman Catholics, members of families that had never changed their allegiance, the Roman Church was, and to a considerable extent still is, alien in this country. The large majority of its poor adherents were, and are, Irish, a large majority of its secular priests were Irish forty years ago, and the old English Roman Catholics, led by Roman Catholic peers, were fearful of anything that would stir up Protestant fanaticism and render their own positions uncomfortable. They by no means welcomed the conversion of Newman in 1845. The last thing that they wanted was to have the limelight turned on them and their Church. It is one of the ironies of the religious history of the nineteenth century that

in his later years Newman, whose conversion lit the undesirable illumination, was to be closely associated with the cautious old Catholic families.

With Manning at Westminster, keenly interested in every phase of the life of his time, continually writing letters to *The Times*, and making public speeches, backing unpopular causes with splendid courage, granted by courtesy the precedence that his ecclesiastical rank would have secured him on the Continent, the Roman Church could no longer be ignored. Manning was English in his bone and marrow, and the institution directed by so English an Englishman could no longer be dismissed as alien. And the Cardinal of whom it was said that he never ate or drank, who, like his Master, was the friend of publicans and sinners, won for his Church a sort of guarded respect which has had one very odd consequence. There is still in England a considerable suspicion of Catholic doctrine. The ignorant and the prejudiced still use such phrases as the "idolatry of the Mass," and the ideas concerning confession, fantastic to persons familiar with the Sacrament of Penance, are still commonly held. But nowadays denunciation is confined entirely to Catholic practices in the English Church. The attitude of the man in the street is : "It is quite all right and proper for a Roman Catholic to make his

confession and to hold the doctrine of the Real Presence, but such things cannot be permitted to persons who owe no fealty to the Pope."

And Rome owes this to Manning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Life of Cardinal Manning, by Edmund Sheredan Purcell. Macmillan & Co.

Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours, by Shane Leslie. Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

The Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne, by Cuthbert Butler, O.S.B. Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

Cardinal Wiseman, by Denis Gwynn. Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

The Dignity and Rights of Labour, by Cardinal Manning. Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

Roman Converts, by Arnold Lunn. Chapman & Hall.

Eminent Victorians, by Lytton Strachey. Chatto & Windus.

The Pastoral Office, by H. E. Manning. Privately printed.

